This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY
ORGANIZED 1891
STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

THE WORKS

OF

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

THE

WORKS

OF THE

MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

WILLIAM LAUD, D.D.

SOMETIME LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

VOL. VI.—PART I.

MISCELLANEOUS PAPERS.—LETTERS.

OXFORD:

JOHN HENRY PARKER.

M DCCC LVII.

KCB

DA 396
L 3 A 2
v. 6:1

PREFACE.

THE contents of the two parts of this Volume which now appear are of a miscellaneous character. They are classed, however, under three general heads, on each of which a few words must here be said.

I. The Miscellaneous Papers, which are placed first, consist almost entirely of documents which have been already published. One of them, the Speech at the censure of Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne, was first printed in 1637, by Laud's own authority, and was subsequently included in the volume of his Remains, published in 1700. The first of the papers against Lord Say and Sele was printed from Laud's MSS., by Henry Wharton, at the end of the History of his Troubles and Trial; and the second of them by Wharton's father, in the volume of the Remains mentioned just above. Of the remaining papers several were printed in Prynne's "Hidden Works of Darkness," and "Canterbury's Doom," in Rushworth's Collections, and the State Trials.

The unpublished part of this portion of the volume consists only of the Paper on Sutton's Hospital, and of the Speech against Prynne and Sparkes.

II. The series of Letters in the first two parts of the sixth volume consists: (i.) Of all the Letters of Archbishop Laud which had already been published, but which hitherto were dispersed in various different works. The English Letters comprise those printed by Prynne, in his "Hidden Works," and "Canterbury's Doom;" in the "Cabala;" by Rushworth, in his "Collections;" by Parr, in his "Life of Usher;" in Wilkins' "Concilia;" by Knowler, in the Strafforde Letters and Dispatches; and in the Rawdon Papers, edited by Barwick. The Latin Letters are taken (with but two exceptions) from the correspondence of G. J. Vossius, printed at London, 1690, and in the "Præstantium ac eruditorum Virorum Epistolæ." These Letters, together with all those hitherto unpublished, (except two which were obtained after the volume had been so far printed,) are now brought together in chronological order.

(ii.) The Letters, which now appear for the first time, include all that could be found in the British Museum, the Lambeth MSS., and the Tanner MSS. in the Bodleian Library, and a few others which the Editor has succeeded in obtaining from private sources.*

This portion of the series, including the Letters from Bishops Bedell and Williams, amount in number to fifty-eight. The correspondence with Bishop Williams is noted as of special interest.

The source, whether printed or MS., from which each Letter is taken, is noticed at its commencement.

* Among others who have kindly allowed unpublished letters in their possession to be transcribed, the Editor wishes especially to mention Edwin H. Lawrence, Esq., the present possessor of the Letter numbered cxcviii. in this Collection.

The number of Letters which have been found, printed and unprinted, have already swelled the volume so much as to require its division into two parts. It was hoped that the whole of Archbishop Laud's Letters would have been included in them. But, when they were almost ready for publication, researches which have been recently made at the State Paper Office brought to light a large amount of additional matter, hitherto unpublished, such as will necessitate the publication of a third part, which will be sent out with the least possible delay.

A "Calendar," or Chronological Arrangement of all the Letters, will be appended at the end of the volume, which will in some measure compensate for the inconvenience which results from their appearing in two distinct series.

III. Notes on the Controversies of Cardinal Bellarmine. The source from whence these are derived, and the assistance which has been furnished to the Editor, both in their transcription and in carrying them through the press, are fully stated in the notice which is prefixed to them. It is sufficient here to say that they are obtained from the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, and have had the advantage of passing under the eye of Dr. Todd.

JAMES BLISS.

Ogbourne St. Andrew,
March 13, 1857.

CONTENTS.

Page

I. Miscellaneous Papers.

1. Reasons for not dissolving Sutton's Hospital . 1
2. The Memorables of King James . . . 5
3. Answer to the Remonstrance of the House of Commons 8
4. Answer to the Order made by the Lower House of Parliament 11
5. Speech against Henry Sherfield . . . 13
6. Paper concerning the Dutch Churches . . 22
7. Speech at the Censure of Sir James Bagg . . 29
8. Speech against Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne . 35
9. Speech at the Trial of Bishop Williams . . 71
10. Answer to Lord Say's Speech touching the Liturgy 83
11. Answer to Lord Say's Speech against the Bishops 147
12. Speech against Prynne and Sparkes . . . 234

II. Letters I—CC. 238

III. Notes on the Controversies of Cardinal Bellarmine . 607

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS.

WHETHER SUTTON'S HOSPITAL MAY BE DISSOLVED, AND THE LANDS, OR THE USE OF THEM, CONVERTED TOWARDS THE MAINTENANCE OF AN ARMY OF 10,000 OR 12,000 MEN, TO BE ALWAYS ON FOOT AND IN PAY, TO SEND INTO IRELAND, OR UPON ANY OTHER NECESSARY SERVICE[a].

[Lamb. MSS. Numb. 943, fol. 119[b].]

1. It may be lawful for a State, in point of necessity, for public defence, to dissolve a society, alms-house, &c., this or any other, one or more, and convert the means to public service (excepting that which is consecrated to the immediate service of God).

Because all such foundations are but for the maintenance of some few members of the commonwealth. And therefore, in the very law of nature, their ordinances must be submitted to the preservation of the whole, in and by which they stand, and in whose ruin (should it so happen) they must also be raked up.

And the will of the Founder dead must be interpreted by the regular and ordinary will of the same Founder living.

[a] [Sutton's Hospital is better known under its more usual title of 'The Charter House.' See an account of this Foundation and the life of the Founder, in Dr. Bearcroft's 'Historical Account.']

[b] [There are two copies of this paper in Lamb. MSS. The transcript is made from the second and fairest of the two copies, excepting one passage mentioned in the notes.

In the margin of the first copy is the following note by Laud:—'Sathurdaye, 25 of Septemb. 1624. I delivered in this answear Wensdaye, Octob. 13, 1624;' to which is added, in Henry Wharton's hand, 'See the Diary on those dayes.']

Which must be that his means, gotten in the commonwealth, and given for the benefit of it, should not be so tied to maintain any few members of the State, as that therewhile it should suffer the whole State to perish or be hazarded.

2. I do not think this lawful (for aught I can yet see), but only in case of necessity. Neither is it honourable for a State to dissolve works of charity upon any other pretence.

3. If the case of necessity cease, I shall ever doubt, whether the State be not bound to restore the Society to the use appointed by the Founder, and the means to maintain it in that use, if the means be not wholly spent and wasted upon that necessary service, whatever that be.

Obj. Yea, but this Hospital is abused.

Ans. But the argument from the abuse of it, therefore to convert it to other use than the Founder appointed by will, is no good argument in either reason or conscience. Unless, perhaps, where it can and doth appear, that there neither is, nor can be, other means to cure that abuse; and that the abuse be such as is not sufferable in a Christian State, which I presume is not here.

Obj. Yea, but the Founder himself appointed this Hospital to maintain old and decayed soldiers; therefore, to convert it to maintain soldiers in present pay, and for necessary use of the State, is as little alteration of his will as may be.

Ans. 1. But this foundation consists of a school, and other maintenance of youth, as well as of decayed soldiers.

2. Besides, the case of conscience proposed is not how near this project comes to the will of the Founder, but whether there be such a necessity now upon this State, that such a foundation should be dissolved? Without which necessity I yet see not how the act can be lawful or expedient.

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS UPON THE PARTICULAR, WHICH I HUMBLY SUBMIT TO BETTER JUDGMENT.

1. Will it not be an ill example to other times that may mean worse to such foundations than I hope the present doth?

2. It is the greatest work that hath been done since the Reformation of religion. Will not, therefore, the dissolving

of it be a great scandal to this State and Church, and give the Roman party just occasion to triumph?

3. Will it not be a great disheartening to all charitable men, to see such works dissolved in the very age that brought them forth?

4. Since the House stuck hard at the consent of passing York House[c], which was a case of far less moment, and by way of valuable exchange, which is lawful where dissolution is not, is it not probable they will deny this? And if it be proposed, and either House cast it out, will not dishonour follow the attempt? And will not they which oppose it get the reputation?

5. Then, will it be thought fit for the State to keep and maintain at all times such an army on foot?

(1.) If it be thought fit, since the revenue of this Hospital falls so much short of maintaining the aforesaid army of 10,000 or 12,000 men, that it will scarce keep 1,000 a year, were it not better to supply all by other good means, than to dispute honour, and for that which can afford scarce one-tenth part to the work?

(2.) If it be not thought fit to continue this army still, will not then, upon the ceasing of it, the former doubt arise, of restoration of the land and hospital to its former use?

6. Can it be fit to have such an army on foot at all times? May it not be thought the commander of them, if he get the love of the soldiers, will command the State too? The Romans had neither their old emperors secure, nor the elections of new free, while their armies were on foot at or near home.

7. Will it not be thought a waste of such expense as will be necessary indeed if a war follow these troubles?

8. Is it not impossible for this State to maintain such an army in pay, and that only out of expectation or fear of danger; the yearly charge whereof will hardly be defrayed for 120,000*l.*?

9. Is it fit at this time to set up such an army[d]; (since you cannot forget the Spanish villany intended against you;) or but to propose it? May not the King reflect, and think it is

[c] [See Works, vol. iii. p. 152.]

[d] [The remainder of this paper is copied from the first of the two Lamb. MSS.]

for other ends than are pretended? And God forbid such a jealousy should possess him!

10. If it be thought fit at this time to have so many men in readiness, and to continue them so for a time, is it not better to take this course: that so many soldiers in divers parts should be trained, and be with their arms at an hour's warning in readiness, for any service at home or abroad? Especially since in this way there is no more charge than the maintenance of captains to train them, a little powder while they are trained, (both which lie upon the county, and not upon the King,) and the loss of their day's work so oft as they train, which may with no great burden be supplied, if it be thought needful. Whereas, the other course, to keep them in continual pay, is too great a charge for any prince, and will but maintain them in idleness and riot.

GUIL. MENEVEN.

THE MEMORABLES

OF

OUR LATE DEAR AND DREAD SOVEREIGN,

KING JAMES,

OF FAMOUS MEMORY.

[Prynne's Breviate, p. 5.]

---

1. He was a king almost from his birth.

2. His great clemency, that he should reign so long and so moderately, that knew nothing else but to reign.

3. The difficult times in Scotland during his minority, as much perplexed with Church as State factions.

4. His admirable patience in those younger times, and his wisdom to go by those many and great difficulties, till God opened him the ways to his just inheritance of this crown.

5. His peaceable entry into this kingdom, contrary to the fears at home and the hopes abroad, and withal God's great blessing both on him and us.

6. His ability, as strong in grace as nature, to forgive some occurrences.

7. The continuance of full twenty-two years' reign all in peace, without war from foreign enemy or rebellion at home.

8. The infinite advantage which people of all sorts might have brought to themselves, and the enriching of the State, if they would have used such a government with answerable care, and not made the worst use of peace.

9. God's great mercy over him in many deliverances from private conspirators, and above the rest, that which would have blown up his posterity and the State by gunpowder.

10. That in all this time of the reign of England he took away the life of no one nobleman, but restored many.

11. That the sweetness of his nature was scarce to be paralleled by any other.

12. It is little less than a miracle, that so much sweetness should be found in so great a heart, as, besides other things, sickness and death itself showed to be in him.

13. Clemency, mercy, justice, and holding the State in peace, have ever been accounted the great virtues of kings, and they were all eminent in him.

14. He was not only a preserver of peace at home, but the great peacemaker abroad; to settle Christendom against the common enemy, the Turk, which might have been a glorious work, if others had been as true to him as he was to the common good.

15. He was in private to his servants the best master that ever was, and the most free.

16. He was the justest man that could sit between parties, and as patient to hear.

17. He was bountiful to the highest pitch of a king.

18. He was the greatest patron to the Church which hath been in many ages.

19. The most learned prince that this kingdom hath ever known for matters of religion.

20. His integrity and soundness of religion, to write and speak, believe and do, live and die, one and the same, and all orthodox.

21. His tender love to the King his son, our most gracious Sovereign that now is, and his constant reverence in performance of all duties to his father, the greatest blessing and greatest example of this and many ages.

22. The education of his Majesty whom we now enjoy (and I hope and pray we may long and in happiness enjoy), to be an able king, as Christendom hath any, the very first day of his reign; the benefit whereof is ours, and the honour his.

23. His sickness at the beginning more grievous than it seemed; a sharp melancholy humour set on fire, though ushered in by an ordinary tertian ague.

24. He was from the beginning of his sickness scarce out

of an opinion that he should die; and therefore did not suffer the great affairs of Christendom to move him more than was fit, for he thought of his end.

25. His devout receiving of the Blessed Sacrament.

26. His regal censure of the moderate reformation of the Church of England, and particularly for the care of retaining of Absolution, the comfort of distressed souls[a].

27. His continual calling for prayers, with an assured confidence in Christ.

28. His death as full of patience as could be found in so strong a death.

29. His rest, no question, is in Abraham's bosom, and his crown changed into a crown of glory.

[a] [See Works, vol. iii. p. 158, note [j].]

ANSWER

TO THE

REMONSTRANCE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

[Prynne's Hidden Works, pp. 93, 94 [a].]

ALTHOUGH we are not bound to give an account of our actions to any but to God only: yet out of the honour and integrity of our grace, the love and care of our people, the great and hearty desire we have to take off all fears and jealousies from our loyal and loving subjects, we have thought fit to declare these reasons following, why we have called in this Remonstrance, which yet we presume and constantly believe was framed and delivered up unto us with good intentions, though by a misguided zeal.

For first, that Remonstrance begins at religion, and fears innovation of it by Popery. But we would have our subjects of all sorts to call to mind what difficulties and dangers we endured, not many years since, for religion's sake; that we are the same still, and our holy religion is as precious to us as it is or can be to any of them, and we will no more admit innovation therein, than they that think they have done well in fearing it so much.

'Tis true that all effects expected have not followed upon the petition delivered at Oxford; but we are in least fault, for that supply being not afforded us, disenabled us to execute all that was desired, and caused the stay of those legal proceedings which have helped to swell up this Remonstrance:

[a] [This paper was found in the Archbishop's study, written with his own hand. It is written, as is obvious, in the name of K. Charles. But, as the Archbishop acknowledged on his Trial that he was the author, (Works, vol. iv. p. 360,) it is here reprinted. The Remonstrance to which it is a reply may be found in Prynne's Hidden Works, pp. 90 seq., and Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. pp. 619 seq.]

yet let all the counties of England be examined, and London and the suburbs with them, neither is there such a noted increase of Papists, nor such cause of fear as is made, nor hath any amounted to such an odious tolerating as is charged upon it, nor near any such.

For that Commission so much complained of, both the matter and intent of it are utterly mistaken; for it doth not dispense with any penalty, or any course to be taken with any Papists for the exercise of their religion; no, nor with the pecuniary mulct, for not-conformity to ours. It was advised for the increase of our profit, and the returning of that into our purse, which abuse, or connivance of inferior ministers might, perhaps, divert another way; if that, or any other, shall be abused in the execution, we will be ready to punish upon any just complaint.

The next fear is the daily growth and spreading of the Arminian faction, called a cunning way to bring in Popery; but we hold this charge as great a wrong to ourself and our government as the former; for our people must not be taught by a Parliament Remonstrance, or any other way, that we are so ignorant of truth, or so careless of the possession of it, that any opinion, or faction, or whatsoever it be called, should thrust itself so far, and so fast into our kingdoms, without our knowledge of it. This is a mere dream of them that wake, and would make our loyal and loving people think we sleep the while.

In this charge there is a great wrong done to two eminent prelates that attend our person[b]; for they are accused without producing any the least show or shadow of proof against them; and should they, or any other, attempt any innovation of religion, either by that open or any cunning way, we should quickly take other order with them, and not stay for your Remonstrance.

To help on this, our people are made believe there is a restraint of books orthodoxal; but we are sure, since the last Parliament began, some, whom the Remonstrance calls orthodox, have assumed to themselves an unsufferable liberty in printing. Our Proclamation commanded a restraint on *both sides*, till the passions of men might subside and calm. And

[b] [Neile and Laud.]

had this been obeyed, as it ought, we had not now been tossed in this tempest; and for any distressing or discountenancing of good preachers, we know there is none, if they be (as they are called) good; but our good people shall never want that spiritual comfort which is due unto them. And for the preferments which we bestow, we have ever made it our great care to give them as rewards of desert and pains: but as the preferments are ours, so will we be judge of the desert ourself, and not be taught by a Remonstrance.

For Ireland, we think, in case of religion, it is not worse than Queen Elizabeth left it: and for other affairs, it is as good as we found it, nay, perhaps better: and we take it for a great disparagement of our government, that it should be voiced, that new monasteries, nunneries, and other superstitious houses, are erected and replenished in Dublin and other great towns of that our kingdom; for we assure ourself, our Deputy and Council there will not suffer God and our government so to be dishonoured, but we should have had some account of it from them; and we may not endure to have our good people thus misled with shows.

There is likewise somewhat considerable in the time when these practices to undermine true religion in our kingdom are set on foot. The Remonstrance tells us it is now, when religion is opposed by open force in all other parts: but we must tell our people, there are no undermining practices at home against it, if they practise not against it that seem most to labour for it. For while religion seems to be contended for in such a factious way (which cannot be God's way), the heat of that doth often melt away that which it labours earnestly (but perhaps not wisely) to preserve. And, for God's judgments, which we and our people have felt, and have cause to fear, we shall prevent them best by a true and religious remonstrance of the amendment of our lives, etc.

AN ANSWER

TO THE

ORDER MADE BY THE LOWER HOUSE OF PARLIAMENT,

THE 28TH OF JANUARY, 162⅞[a].

[Prynne's Cant. Doom, pp. 163, 164.]

1. THE public Acts of the Church in matters of doctrine are Canons and Acts of Councils, as well for expounding as determining; the Acts of the High-Commission are not in this sense public Acts of the Church, nor the meeting of few or more bishops *extra concilium*, unless they be by lawful authority called to that work, and their decision approved by the Church.

2. The current exposition of writers is a strong probable argument *de sensu Canonis Ecclesiæ, vel Articuli*, yet but probable. The current exposition of the Fathers themselves hath sometimes missed *sensum Ecclesiæ*.

3. Will ye reject all sense of Jesuit or Arminian? May not some be true? May not some be agreeable to our writers, and yet in a way stronger than ours to confirm the Article?

4. Is there by this Act any interpretation made or declared of the Articles, or not? If none, to what end the Act? If a sense or interpretation be declared, what authority have laymen to make it? For interpretation of an Article belongs to them only that have power to make it.

[a] [The order made by the House of Commons is as follows: "We, the Commons now assembled in Parliament, do claim, profess, and avow for truth, the sense of the Articles of Religion, which were established in Parliament the thirteenth year of Queen Elizabeth; which, by the public Acts of the Church of England, and the general and current exposition of the writers of our Church, have been delivered unto us; and we reject the sense of the Jesuits, Arminians, and all others, wherein they do differ from us."]

5. 'Tis manifest there is a sense declared by the House of Commons; the Act says it: We avow the Article, and in that sense; and all other that agree not with us in the aforesaid sense we reject. These and these go about misinterpretations of a sense: *ergo*, there is a declaration of sense. Yea, but it is not a new sense, declared by them, but they avow the old sense declared by the Church, 'the public authentic Acts of the Church.' Yea, but if there be no such public authentic Acts of the Church, then here 's a sense of their own declared under pretence of it.

6. It seems against the King's Declaration. (1.) That says, we shall take the general meaning of the Articles. This Act restrains them to consent of writers. (2.) That says, the Article shall not be drawn aside any way; but that we shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense. This Act ties to consent of writers, which may, and perhaps do, go against the literal sense; for here 's no exception; so we shall be perplexed, and our consent required to things contrary.

7. All consent, in all ages, as far as I have observed, to an Article or Canon, is to itself, as it is laid down in the body of it; and if it bear more senses than one, it is lawful for any man to choose what sense his judgment directs him to, so that it be a sense *secundum analogiam fidei;* and that he hold it peaceably, without distracting the Church; and this till the Church, which made the Article, determine a sense. And the wisdom of the Church hath been in all ages, or the most, to require consent to Articles in general, as much as may be, because that is the way of unity; and the Church in high points requiring assent to particulars, hath been rent. As *de transubstantiatione.*

SPEECH IN THE STAR-CHAMBER,

AT THE

CENSURE OF HENRY SHERFIELD, ESQ.

RECORDER OF SALISBURY,

FOR BREAKING A PAINTED GLASS WINDOW IN THE CHURCH OF ST. EDMUND IN THE SAID CITY,

FEB. 8TH, 1632.

[Hargrave's State Trials, vol. i. coll. 412—414.]

IF there be *defensio facti* or *confessio facti*, or else two witnesses, I think any one of these three will be a sufficient proof to convict a man of an offence; and I have observed there are all these together in this cause against Mr. Sherfield. He confesseth that he broke the windows, and setteth forth his justification in his Answer to Mr. Attorney's information; and this was done by him with his pike-staff, as is testified by two witnesses, such as they were; yet they were eye-witnesses, which is the strongest testimony. I am persuaded, as I am a private man, that at least he heard of the Bishop's inhibition; I do not say but *ignorantia facti* may excuse a man in such a case, at least *a tanto*, though not *a toto* perchance; but *ignorantia juris* never doth excuse[a]; yet, because it is not directly proved that he had notice of the Act of Inhibition made by my Lord Bishop, I shall forbear to give my sentence touching this particular, the rather because he hath cleared himself of it by his oath; and yet I have met with as strange an equivocation in some of late as almost hath been heard of, I have not read the like; but seeing there is not plain proof, I must not judge him other than an honest man.

[a] [Digest. lib. xxii. tit. vi. 'De juris et facti ignorantia.']

Mr. Herbert[b] hath defended this as well as ever any did a cause to my knowledge. As for Vestries, which were made and suffered first by negligence doubtless, yet being of continuance, we cannot so easily restrain the power which they use. I have had experience of what I speak therein; in a parish church within my diocese, St. Lawrence by name, there is a Vestry. It fell out once that they could not agree upon some election. I interposed as Ordinary; I had no sooner done this but I was inhibited by the Archbishop of Canterbury; afterward, by his Grace's means, it was referred to me to end, which I endeavoured; but then a prohibition at the common law was sent me: so that it is not an easy matter to restrain a custom.

But it is not in the power of a Vestry to remove or displace anything in the church that is doubtful; and though they made an order in this case, for the taking down of the window[c], yet it was Mr. Sherfield's fault to go disorderly to work; his violent and riotous breaking into the church, and upon a consecrated thing, is criminal in him.

Whereas divers things touching his conformity have been proved, I am confident upon good information that had the cause been followed as well as defended (but it was ill followed by them that prosecuted, and unworthy their places), many more things might have been proved against him; and that it would have appeared, he had done more harm underhand in his place, than good otherwise. But for his trouble of conscience, which should impel to this action, it troubled not much, for he kept it in, and nourished it, till it grew, as you see, to a great head, so that at last it hath brought him hither, even to the sentence of this court.

My conscience being laid at stake, I am not of opinion that images and pictures were not in the Church till the time of Gregory the Great; nor am I of opinion that the first trouble about them was at the second Council of Nice. St. Gregory,

[b] [Afterwards Sir Edward Herbert.]

[c] [The order of the Vestry passed Jan. 162⅞, was as follows: "It is ordered that Mr. Recorder may, if it please him, take down the window wherein God is painted in many places as if He were there creating the world, so as he do instead thereof new make the same window with white glass; for that the said window is somewhat decayed and broken, and is very darksome, whereby such as sit near the same cannot see to read in their books."—Vestry-book of S. Edmund's, quoted in Hatcher's History of Salisbury, p. 371.]

who was 600 years after Christ, in his 9th Book and 9th Epistle written to [Serenus], saith of images, *Vetustas admisit*[d]. But, 200 years before this, we find that Gregory, surnamed the Divine, otherwise called Gregory Nazianzen, when the Emperor laid siege to the city of which he was bishop, in his oration to the said Emperor, to move him to pity, saith that the citizens, above all their losses, spoiling of the city walls, ruining of their houses and temples, took to heart the pulling down of their statues. *Et hoc acerbum*, saith he[e]. Nay, we find them in the Church 200 years after Christ; they were upon the chalice, and that is ever upon the altar.

In Tertullian's time, (who was one of the ancientest Fathers,) there was painted upon the chalice the picture of the shepherd bringing home the lost sheep upon his shoulders[f]; and this was objected against Tertullian himself, who in his latter time fell into the opinion and error of the Montanists, who are against second marriage and repentance after baptism, affirming that no repentance is left to him that sinneth after baptism; against which error the Church used this symbol of the shepherd bringing home the lost sheep.

Again, in the time of that ancient Father, Irenæus, who is held to be the scholar of St. John, they had the picture of Jesus Christ; and they had it from the Gnostics, who had adorations with it and sacrifices; and therefore the holy Father condemned that picture, because (saith he) the Gnostics did that to this picture which the heathen did to their idol gods[g]. But it hath been a distasteful thing to

[d] ["Frangi vero non debuit quod non ad adorandum in Ecclesiis, sed ad instruendas solummodo mentes nescientium fuit collocatum. Et quia in locis venerabilibus sanctorum depingi historias non sine ratione vetustas admisit, etc."—S. Greg. Mag. lib. xi. Ind. iv. Ep. xiii. Op., tom. ii. col. 1100.]

[e] [He refers to the following passage in the letter of S. Greg. Naz. to the Prefect Olympius:—Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ ἀνδριάντες κατενεχθήσονται, τοῦτο δεινόν, εἰ καὶ ἄλλως δεινόν· μηδὲ περὶ τούτων νομίσῃς ἡμῶν εἶναι τὸν λόγον, οἷς περὶ τὰ κρείττονα ἡ σπουδή.—S. Greg. Naz. Epist. xlix. Op., tom. i. p. 810. C. D. This passage refers, however, to statues on the buildings of the city, and not to images in churches. (See (Tertullian, Oxf. Translation, vol. i. p. 112, note [b].]

[f] ["A parabolis licebit incipias, ubi est ovis perdita a Domino requisita, et humeris ejus revecta. Procedant ipsæ picturæ calicum vestrorum."—Tert. de Pudicit. cap. vii. Op., p. 379. "Si forte patrocinabitur pastor, quem in calice depingis." — Ibid. cap. x. p. 392.]

[g] ["Et imagines quasdam depictas, quasdam autem et de reliqua materia fabricatas habent, dicentes formam Christi factam a Pilato, illo in tempore quo fuit Jesus cum hominibus. Et has coronant et proponunt eas cum imaginibus mundi philosophorum."—S. Iren. contr. omn. Hæret. lib. i. cap. xxv. § 6. Op., p. 105.]

remove pictures and images. We read that the Bishop of Cyrene broke the pictures in the churches, which his people took so ill, that they rose against him, and were hardly appeased.

And of late times we have had experience of like mischiefs in France and the Low Countries about this matter. And we know what rebellions were raised in the beginning of the Reformation, in this kingdom and in Germany: when Carlostadius and his company went about to pull down and deface the images in the churches, what a stir was there! If Luther himself had not come back, and appeased the multitude by his timely advice, that the work of reformation was to be left to the supreme magistrates, (which was well done of him, and a thing wherein he showed his wisdom,) much more mischief would have ensued[h]. I do not say these things to any such purposes as that images should have any part of divine adoration.

When these were brought into the churches, as one side fell to worshipping them, so the other side fell to breaking and defacing them, which bred many broils; and amongst the rest one very sharp contention, by reason of the prevailing of worshippers of images, was stirred in the time of Constantine the Great[i]; for I read the Empress gave her voice against her son Constantine to put him off from the empire; because of his defacing of the images which they had in their churches. But for that gross Council of Nice, (pardon me this gross term, but they deserve it in my opinion,) they decree the same honour was to be done to the image as to the life, whether it were the picture of man, or of God, or of Christ. And then another decree in that Council was, that a man must rather endure penury than do violence to a picture; and their absurd distinction of *latria* and *doulia*, &c.[k] Yet this I say, there is a great deal of difference between an image and an idol; but then, if men give worship to them as to the other, it is unlawful.

[h] [See Cochlæus, in Vita Lutheri, an. 1522.]

[i] [There seems to be some inaccuracy in this statement.]

[k] [Ὁρίζομεν... παραπλησίως τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταύρου ἀνατίθεσθαι τὰς σέπτας καὶ ἁγίας εἰκόνας... καὶ ταύταις ἀσπασμὸν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονέμειν οὐ μὴν τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, ἣ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θείᾳ φύσει... ἡ γὰρ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει.—Conc. Nic. ii. Act. vii.—Conc. tom. vii. col. 555. C—E.]

As for the Injunctions in the Queen's time, this was done by public authority[1], and done in every place by the proper judge. And touching the matter in question, I do not think it lawful to make the picture of God the Father; but 'tis lawful to make the picture of Christ, and Christ is called the express image of His Father. I don't mean to say that the picture of Christ as God the Son may be made; for the Deity cannot be portrayed or pictured, though the humanity may. I do not think but the representation of God the Father (as in the prophet Daniel he is called the 'Ancient of Days') hath been allowed, though erroneously, to be made like an ancient old man: and this the Lutheran party hold too; but whether it be idolatrous or superstitious, or no, this I hold not to be the question. And I shall crave liberty not to declare my opinion at this time, whether it ought to be removed. But the defendant, Mr. Sherfield, did this in contempt, at least in neglect of the Church's authority, and the authority of the King's Majesty; for the Church derive their authority from the King, as well as the civility. I shall therefore sentence him for breaking this window, whether it were fit or no to be in the church. If it had been white glass, it would have been the same thing to me; it was a violent and raging act, and it is now a business of great weight and ill consequence, and therefore fit for the timely censure of this court. And I say further, if it had been the idol of Jupiter, and they had professed divine worship to it, it had not have been lawful for Mr. Sherfield or any private man to deface it; and this I shall prove and maintain by Scripture.

The idol of Jupiter was but as the golden calf which Aaron made, before which the people of Israel committed idolatry; yet we see judgment was executed by the supreme magistrate, by command from God, and the tribe of Levi was commanded to kill the idolaters.

Then, again, there was a brazen serpent appointed to be set up by the Lord Himself; and afterwards it became an idol, and the people committed idolatry with it; yet none of all Israel presumed to break it down, but Hezekiah the king did it. Also the calves of Jeroboam, set up at Dan and Bethel, were plain idols; yet they continued a long time, and were

[1] [Injunc. xxiii.—Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. p. 185.]

not pulled down, till Josiah the king did it, and this he doth by his supreme power; and the king did this by the priests of the first and second order. Both these appear in their stories in the Fourth Book of Kings, the 18th and 23d chapters.

As for the second commandment, 'Thou shalt not make any graven image,' or picture, 'to thyself.' No, take heed, worship it not, howsoever it be: if thou dost make an image, yet thou shalt not worship it. But there is no command or example for breaking of images (when they are made) without public authority. You shall see this plainly in that altar set up by the Reubenites and Gadites at Jordan: this was conceived by some of the people to be an idolatrous thing, at least an intention in them to set up another manner of worship, and Jerusalem was the place of worship only. There was an embassage sent unto them, and Phineas and other princes were employed on it. They did not presently fall upon them, and break down the altar, though they had special and strict command to overthrow and break down all idolatrous and heathen altars, groves, places of idolatry, and images; but this they were not to do presently,—they were to tarry till the land was theirs, in their own power, as you may see in the 7th and 12th chapters of Deut. But you will say, these were for the Jews, but not for us in the times of the Gospel. In St. Augustin's time, the people committed idolatry with their images, and many there were that would have pulled down the images (the causes of this idolatry). St. Augustin adviseth—No, first preach them out of men's hearts; and he called upon the ministers so to do; but you shall not pull them down (saith he) till the supreme power doth it, or power were given them [m]. Thus, if it were Jupiter's picture, Mr. Sherfield or any others are not to pull it down till power be given them. And Gerardus the Lutheran is of the same opinion.

The Homily against Idolatry (so much magnified [n]) plainly shows it to belong to the supreme magistrate, and has reference to such pictures as are upon walls; but stories upon

[m] [See S. Aug. Serm. lxii. (al. de Verb. Dom. vi.) § 17. Op., tom. v. col. 520. D. The passage is quoted in History of Troubles and Trial, chap. xxxiv. Works, vol. iv. p. 238.]

[n] [Urged by Sherfield in his defence.]

glass windows were not here meant. And as for my Lord Bishop of Salisbury his book of worthy Lectures[o] at Cambridge, upon the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Collossians, upon these words, 'Walk wisely towards them that are without,' what saith he? Why, the very same that St. Austin did before, that a private man hath neither *vocationem* nor *potestatem* to do it: thus, if he had read a little further[p], he should have found direction to have walked wisely. And, indeed, those that are out of the Church must be dealt wisely withal. When you see these things, you cannot, as the Israelites did not, deface them, for they belong only to the supreme power. And you shall see St. Paul's practice, in the 17th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles; he saw they had set up an altar to the unknown God, yet he went not to pull it down, but to teach them that God which they knew not, even as St. Austin afterwards advised.

So I come to this, which is the work of the day: this is a violent, riotous, and profane entering into the church by him, to break this window down with his pike-staff: and as the matter standeth proved to me, it seemeth there are these circumstances of aggravation of his fault:—

1. The first circumstance of aggravation is, that when he went about the taking down of this window, he went not unto the Bishop, but chose another way.

2. He was twenty years offended at it; and in all this time, we think, some good spirit might have suggested unto him better advice, if he would have followed it.

3. By his office and authority, his fault is the greater and more scandalous.

4. By his age, being grown grey, he should have learned wisdom.

5. That when he went to do this, he went in private, which some have said to be well done; but I am not of that opinion. True, if it had been a work of necessity in him to take it down, he might have done it; but then he must follow his order, and he should then have taken a glazier with him to have taken it down, and not break it down with his staff.

[o] [Davenant on the Colossians, cap. iv. 5. p. 490. Cant. 1627.]

[p] [Sherfield in his defence referred to a certain book of the now Bishop of Sarum (Dr. John Davenant), written on one of S. Paul's Epistles.]

6. His offence is the greater by his office of justice of peace; certainly herein he was not *conservator pacis*, for besides the force and violence, there might have been much discord and bloodshed about it, as was well observed by Mr. Attorney.

7. By the doing of this act contrary to his conformity, there have been the like insolences done in the same church, for which I think there is a cause against some of them depending in the High-Commission Court. There was a tomb of a dead bishop there: his bones taken up, his skull made a mazer in an apothecary's shop (as I am informed), his dust thrown about, and all to bury a tanner's wife[q].

8. In regard of his tenderness of conscience, which he alleged for himself; my reason is, for that, if he were of tender conscience indeed; yet in this thing I shall sentence him, for not going to the Bishop to reveal it to him; if it were but a show of tenderness, then surely there was the more wilfulness in his offence, and this can be no excuse.

9. His fault is aggravated from his profession. It is an honourable profession; and as it is a great offence in a divine to infringe the law of the kingdom wherein he is born and bred up, so it is also a great offence if those of the profession of the law vilify the poor laws of the Church. Thus much let me say to Mr. Sherfield, and such of his profession as slight the ecclesiastical laws and persons, that there was a time when Churchmen were as great in this kingdom as you are now; and let me be bold to prophesy, there will be a time when you will be as low as the Church is now, if you go on thus to contemn the Church.

To proceed, he went into the church. It pleased God to give him a fall upon the place, and if it had not been God's mercy, he had broken his back upon the edge of the pew. Yet all this while these things have not wrought him to any confession that he hath done amiss; nay, he saith he was persecuted for God's cause (as I am informed), but I think he persecuted the poor sexton of the church; they put him in prison, and there kept him, and would have kept him, if my Lord Bishop had not sent bail; and if it had not been for the Bishop, they would have turned him out of his place.

[q] ["This assertion appears to have been made on erroneous information." —Hatcher's History of Salisbury, p. 373.]

And then, just upon the fact committed, cometh a new Lecturer to town, and he pitcheth upon the text, Psalm cxix. ver. 121: 'I have executed judgment and justice; leave me not to mine oppressors.'

I have been the willinger to render this account at this time, because some are ready to slander us as maintainers of Popish superstition, and I know not what.

As for my sentence, I agree with my Lord Cottington [r].

[r] [The recorded sentence of the court was, that Sherfield should be committed to the Fleet, fined 500*l.*, and ordered to repair to the Lord Bishop of his Diocese, and there make an acknowledgment of his offence and contempt, before such persons as the Bishop would call unto him.]

CONCERNING

THE DUTCH AND FRENCH CHURCHES

IN ENGLAND.

[Prynne, Cant. Doom, pp. 398—402.]

WHEREAS I was commanded by your Lordships, upon Friday, March 22, 1632, first, to represent to his gracious Majesty the great and honourable care you had to preserve the unity and government of the Church of England, as it stands now established by law, which care was very great and pious; and according to my duty, in the name of the Church, I humbly thank your Lordships for it; and have, in pursuance of your commands, faithfully acquainted his Majesty with as many particulars as I could carry away safe in my memory.

Secondly, I was commanded by your Lordships to take into further consideration such heads as might best conduce to the rectifying of such his Majesty's subjects as reside at Hamborough, or elsewhere beyond the seas, but especially in the Low Countries, either in merchandise, or in use and exercise of arms under the colonels there: as also what might be thought fit to be done concerning the French and Dutch Churches, as they now stand, and are used at this present within this realm; but at such time as your Lordships in your wisdom shall best approve.

Concerning the first of these, viz. the English living in Foreign Parts, I humbly recommend to your Lordships' wisdom, as followeth:—

1. Whether it be not fit (I had almost said necessary) that the several colonels in the Low Countries should entertain no

minister as preacher to their regiments, but such as shall conform in all things to the Church of England established, and be commended unto them from your Lordships by advice of the Lords Archbishops of Canterbury or York for the time being.

2. That the company of merchants residing there, or in other foreign parts, shall admit no minister as preacher to them, but such as are so qualified and so commended as aforesaid.

3. That if any minister, having by feigned carriage gotten to be so recommended, either to any of the several colonels, or to the deputy-governor and body of the merchants there, shall after be found unconformable, and will not mend upon warning given him by the colonel or deputy-governor of the merchants, [he] shall, within three months after such warning given and refused, be dismissed from his service, that a more orderly and peaceable man may be sent unto them.

4. That every minister or preacher, with any regiment of soldiers that are his Majesty's born subjects, or with the company of merchants there or elsewhere, shall read Divine service, christen children, administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, marry, instruct the younger or more ignorant sort in the Catechism, visit the sick, bury the dead, and do all other duties according as they are prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer maintained in the Church of England, and not otherwise. And that he which will not conform himself so to do, shall not continue preacher, either to any regiment of English, or Scottish, or to the merchants.

5. That if any minister or preacher, being the King's subject, shall with any bitter words or writings, in print or otherwise, defame the government of the Church of England established, his Majesty's ambassador or agent in those parts for the time being is to be informed of it; and upon notice given from him to the State, he or they so offending shall be commanded over by Privy Seal, or otherwise, to answer their offence or offences here.

6. That no colonel of any several regiment, or deputy-governor of the merchants, shall give way that their minister or preacher shall bring any other minister to preach for him in time of his sickness, absence, or other necessary employ-

ment, but such as for whose conformity to the Church and Government here he will be answerable.

7. That if any minister being a subject of the King, in the Low Countries, or any other place beyond the seas, shall in any other auditory, as well as before the regiments or the merchants, preach or publish, or in any other way by public speech, writing, or printing, divulge anything derogatory to the doctrine or discipline established in the Church of England, or otherwise prejudicial to the temporal state and government, his Majesty's agent there shall use the best means he can to discover him or them so offending, and having found them, shall presently certify the State here, that so they may be recalled by Privy Seal to answer it. And if they then refuse to come, that the law in that case pass upon them.

8. That no man shall be chosen or sent over by the merchants here, either to Delf, or any other place of their residence beyond the seas, (whensoever such place or places shall become void,) but such a man as is conformable to the Church of England both in doctrine and discipline, and such as will be careful to see that they which are under his government shall observe all such Church duties as are expressed and required in any the former Articles. And that some of the chief merchant-adventurers here be sent for to the Board, and be made acquainted with this Article. And further, that at every time and times that they send a new deputy-governor to any place of their residence, they present the said deputy to the Lords, and give them assurance of his fitness and sufficiency for that charge; at which time the said deputy may have such directions given him by their Lordships as the present times and occasions require. And that there be like care taken for other good officers there, as for the deputy-governor himself.

9. That whensoever the merchant-adventurers shall become suitors to his Majesty to renew or confirm their patent, (as in most Kings' times it is usual so to do,) that then there be a clause inserted into their patent, to bind them to the observance of all or so much of these Instructions as shall be thought fit by his Majesty and the Lords.

10. That the present agent, as also all others that shall

succeed in that employment, have these Instructions given them in charge; and that once a-year they be required to give the Board an account what the proceed of the business is. That so his Majesty's subjects, as well abroad as at home, may be kept in orderly obedience, to the honour of his Majesty's government, and the better uniting of the hearts of his people to God, his Majesty, and one to another, in which will consist the strength as well as the honour of the kingdom.

11. I conceive it no way fit, that the ministers which are his Majesty's subjects in Holland, should have any classical meetings allowed them (as it seems they pretend some grant since the year 1622), especially that they be not suffered to assume power of ordination; for then it will be a perpetual seminary to breed and transplant men ill affected to the Government into this kingdom.

It is to be observed that the French and High German congregations in the Low Countries do all observe the Liturgy of their own mother Churches; only the English observe neither their own, nor any other uniformity.

Concerning the second; that is, the French and Dutch Churches, as they now stand in many parts of this Kingdom, I as humbly represent, first the danger, then the probable remedy.

For the dangers I humbly submit, but conceive as followeth:—

1. It was honour and piety in this State, when at the first way was given for those Churches, both in London and some other parts of this kingdom; because at that time there was persecution upon them in their own countries, and the peace with which God then blessed this kingdom was their safety.

2. I conceive it was never the meaning and purpose of this State, then or at any other time, that they living and continuing here, marrying, and having wives and children, and many of them plentiful fortunes, and lands; and their children and children's children being now natives, and his Majesty's born subjects, should live like an absolute divided body from the Church of England established, which must needs work upon their affections, and alienate them from the State, or at least

make them ready for any innovation that may sort better with their humour.

3. It is likewise considerable what an entire and divided body they keep themselves. For few, or none of them, marry with any of us, but only one with another. Upon which it must needs follow, that as they increase and multiply, they which are now a Church within a Church, will in time grow to be a kind of another commonwealth within this, and so ready for that which I hold not fit to express any further.

4. It is likewise of great consequence, that these men living with their entire families, divided from the present government of Church and Commonwealth, are many, and have got their residence and settlement in all or most of the haven towns, especially such as lie fittest for France and the Low Countries. And were occasion offered, God knows what advantage they may take to themselves, or make for others.

5. Their example is of ill consequence (in Church affairs especially) to the subjects of England. For many are confirmed in their stubborn ways of disobedience to the Church-government, seeing them so freely suffered in this great and populous city.

6. Last of all, I think it very just not to suffer French or Dutch Churches, differing from us in discipline, to be otherwise or longer tolerated in any part of this realm, than the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England shall, among the subjects of this crown, be tolerated in those several parts beyond the seas, whither they have cause to resort and abide.

For the remedies likewise I humbly submit, but conceive they may be these:—

1. I think it fit their number in all places of this kingdom be made known as fully as may be; that your Lordships may the better judge both of them, and the way to reduce them into one body with this kingdom, in which they are born subjects.

2. I conceive the best way to know their number is by a command from the State itself, and to have it avowedly taken

in all places where they reside; with a certificate, either presently, or when your Lordships shall think fit, which are the men of credit and wealth among them. And this may be done really for their good, and so sweetened, as that they may apprehend it for a benefit, as indeed it is.

3. It is fit, if they will continue as a divided body from both State and Church, that they be used as strangers, and not as natives. That is, that they may pay all double duties, as strangers use to do, and have no more immunities than strangers have, till they will live and converse as other subjects do. And this matter of loss or gain is as likely to work upon them, especially the merchants and richer men, as any other thing, and perhaps more.

4. When it shall be thought fit actually to reduce them to live as other subjects do, both in relation to Church and State, the way I conceive may be, to have them fairly warned in an ecclesiastical way, for every man with his household (if he be not a new comer, but a born subject) to repair to his parish church here, to conform himself to prayers, sacraments, &c. And if any receive not according to canon, and law, then to excommunicate him and them. And by that time the writ *de excommunicato capiendo* hath been served upon some few, it may be the rest will yield themselves.

5. If this do not prevail, then I conceive, under favour, it will be hard to remedy, unless the State will publicly declare, That if they will be as natives, and take the benefit of subjects, they must conform themselves to the laws of the kingdom, as well ecclesiastical as temporal. Which declaration, when it shall once be made public, I think they will be well advised before they will resist or refuse it.

INJUNCTIONS TO THE DUTCH AND WALLOON CHURCHES,

A.D. 1634, 1635.

[Prynne's Cant. Doom, p. 402.]

1. THAT all the natives of the Dutch and Walloon congregations in his Grace's diocese, are to repair to their several parish churches, of those several parishes where they inhabit, to hear Divine service and sermons, and perform all duties and payments required in that behalf.

2. That the ministers, and all others of the Dutch and Walloon congregations, which are not natives and born subjects to the King's Majesty, or any other strangers that shall come over to them, while they remain strangers, may have and use their own discipline, as formerly they have done; yet it is thought fit, that the English Liturgy should be translated into French and Dutch, for the better settling of their children to the English government.

NOTES OF SPEECH

AT THE

CENSURE OF SIR JAMES BAGG AND OTHERS,

Nov. 10, 1635[a].

[Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. pp. 310—313.]

My Lords,

THIS is a cause of great danger, I shall be as short as I can; before I speak of the defendant, I shall speak of the great minister of state. If the court think fit to leave it to my Lord of Portland[b] to vindicate his father's honour, I shall do so too. I do remember what both my Lord Chief Justices[c] have said, whether this charge can be severed from the scandal, or not? Whether a necessity to name the Lord Treasurer, or not? I do conceive it to be unavoidable. If a necessity in using his name, then what fault in Sir Anthony Pell? If no necessity, I must condemn Bagg for being in a far greater fault, that by his open mouth so much vilified the honour of the name of my Lord Treasurer. I descend to the delivery of my judgment clearly, and am of opinion that my Lord Treasurer's honour standeth right in this court, there being nothing by way of proof or aspersion that can fasten upon him. If anything, it must arise from the plaintiff, or from the defendants. And I shall be as ready as any man to protect the honour of that great lord, be it against Pell, or Bagg, or whom else soever. But, my Lords, if it be a fault in Sir Anthony Pell, for the spreading of this, the fault must

[a] [This was an action by Sir Anth. Pell against Sir James Bagg, for defrauding him of sundry sums of money, under pretence of paying them as a bribe to the Earl of Portland, the Lord Treasurer, in order to secure for Pell some claims he had on the Treasury.—See Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. pp. 302, 303.]

[b] [Jerome Weston, second Earl of Portland.]

[c] [Finch and Bramston.]

light upon Sir James Bagg, for he gave the occasion of all these reports.

My Lords,

Having, as far as lieth in me, done the duty I owe to the dead, whom I hold to be clear in all, I shall fall upon the particulars. First, for the examiner. I never knew so many gross abuses in any cause, by an examiner, as in this. If this course be held, any cause of the King's may be overthrown. Since I had the honour to sit in this court, never such gross abuses were committed by an examiner. That order may be taken with this base examiner, I hold him to be the most unworthy fellow, and a cut-throat of any man's cause.

For Sir Richard Tichburne, I hold him innocent from any aspersion; but I can give him no reparation. What if five or six defendants, and only proof be brought against them, one or two, shall this fall foul upon the plaintiff for want of proof?

For the plaintiff's debt, I shall not say anything, nor think it a crime that Pell was delayed in the payment of his money; for the King hath a great many very great public and important occasions, that he cannot pay all upon demand. And withal considering that the original debt was but 7,000*l.*, and it suddenly grew to above 13,000*l.*, therefore the Lord Treasurer had need to look about him. God forbid, that upon main occasions, when the King promiseth a suit (perhaps directly) of so much money, and is not presently paid, that the King must pay interest for this; this is no fair usage of the King.

The thing that troubleth me is this, of the attendants on the Lord Treasurer. If the Lord Treasurer have a near kinsman, or secretary, or any other employed for him, if those men shall be corrupt, or do those acts which shall make the world believe it is so, it shall be as much as if they were really guilty. For by this means the people will run on with an opinion of bribery and corruption. They cannot have it out of this great man's hand, but they must go that way of bribery to the secretary for it. It shall not only bring great men into despite, who perhaps never heard of it; but men when they cannot have their money without going this way, care not what they do.

Because he nameth the great officer in the bill, is it a scandal? Must this be a terror to any man for doing the King's service? Oh, but there is meddling with the King's revenue. What hath Sir Anthony Pell to do with it? If there be but a possibility of fraud, shall the King have no court of justice to do him right? If it come to this pass, that no abuse concerning the revenue must be questioned, the King shall never know what the escheat is.

Here are four defendants:—

For Sir Richard Tichburne, the Lord Treasurer had no dishonour by him; a gentleman of an ancient family, and very worthy as any man; therefore I shall concur, that the sentence may be drawn up with a fair mention of his manifest innocency throughout the cause.

For the second defendant, Mr. Gibbins, I do clear him.

For the third defendant, his secretary, Mr. Lake, I am very sorry to meet him here upon this occasion, not that I shall censure him, but yet somewhat sticketh with me, and that is his letter to Mr. Bond, that upon his faith and credit he had assignments of 6,000*l.* in keeping for the plaintiff. Should he be so adventurous as to write so without his lord's privity? It troubleth me the more, partly for the proof of it, because there are six days between Sir James Bagg's advancement of 2,000*l.*, and Mr. Lake's letter to Bond to help Sir Anthony to 3,000*l.*, therefore a fraud is contrived in some kind. Yet I shall acquit Mr. Lake, though I cannot think so well of him as I have done.

My Lords,

Now as for Sir James Bagg, I do not stand upon it, whether Sir Anthony Pell is damnified in this business, yea or no? The question is, what fraudulent practices are here by Sir James Bagg? And if there be but an intention to do the same, I hold him as guilty as if he had done it. Join this together with his using of my Lord Treasurer's name to lend these monies, that so he might be enticed by that merely to get the assignments; I do hold this practice to be criminal in this court.

The proof is, That he had experience in businesses of this nature; he was to have but seven hundred pounds for his pains. He must to Wallingford House; though in answer

to this it was wittily observed by Sir James Bagg's Counsel, this construction, (*sensu diviso, sensu composito,*) that he must pay the money, and then presently to Wallingford House, and pay the money there.

If two witnesses not concurring in time and place, yet if they shall concur in proving the crime, they are of force to me, they all come home to this plot and practice. I should be of opinion with my Lord of London, if these things were several.

But consider the shoehorn they draw on by the name of the Lord Treasurer, and the plot will appear.

I find this money pretended to be for my Lord Treasurer, though it was never paid back again, nor ever tendered; and yet what a glorious defence at bar was offered, that Bagg would not pay it till the bill came in. For why? Because that the world should not take notice, that he was afraid of the bill. This is but a gloss and weakening of himself. All the world may see, if it had not been for the bill, Sir Anthony Pell should never have had his money. It is even as if one fall upon another in the highway, and they rob him, and make him enter into bond, that he will not question him hereafter; and then others come and see them, then he that robbed him answers, Here is your money, I did but borrow it. I conceive the getting of the money by Bagg from Pell as bad, as if he had gone away with the two thousand and five hundred pounds.

I agree in one thing with my Lord Finch, that Bagg was a most unnatural man, that had drawn two thousand five hundred pounds for the use of himself and his friends, from the plaintiff. And whereas Sir Anthony was in a strait how to advance three thousand pounds, that he should be so hard-hearted (that two thousand five hundred pounds being in his hands) as not to help him at such a time, I would have sentenced him for this unnatural part alone. Poor Sir Anthony must suffer all this, while it is likely Bagg would never have been gulled in a business. He was an ingenious man, Sir Anthony was a single plain man.

If Bagg had put this bill in, I should have conceived the worst of it; but I shall never believe poor Sir Anthony had in him that malice, as if Bagg had put it in. For his Counsel to take exceptions against witnesses at the hearing,

is of dangerous consequence; any cause of the King's may be so spoiled. They say one of Sir Anthony's witnesses was but seventeen years of age; if it were so, yet he was of age enough to tell and receive money. They except against them because they are Sir Anthony's servants. Who are so proper to be witnesses as his men? Why is here no exception taken to Sir James Bagg's witnesses? for he had two sworn as well as Sir Anthony.

For Mr. Escourt, they say he was then present, and heard no such words as Marsh sweareth. That might be true, and he not hear; for they might be spoke, and not in his hearing. What if Pell did fail in the proof of his bill, not only in the matter, but in the manner?

I will not look upon Pell, but upon the public; but I hold this proved both in matter and manner; for it would not have been sufficient for Pell to have proved he was cozened thus much, but in this manner. That which is worst of all, and is so foul, that his Counsel offered no defence, and that was Bagg's own answer; where he sweareth, that he never did deserve any such kindness of Sir Anthony Pell for to do so great courtesy, as to lend him these monies. Look but upon, and see the many letters he writ; 'James Bagg, your most real friend; your business will be better done, if you leave it to your friend James Bagg.' Here is his hand against his oath, and his oath against his hand. He was a most base fellow to say, 'Your most real friend,' and to serve Sir Anthony as he did. I have now done with that bottomless Bagg, and my censure. I leave my Lord of Portland to do what he thinketh fit against him. I hold it as dangerous a practice of him as ever was in this kind. I fine him at 5,000*l.*, and imprisonment during the King's pleasure; only pray, that a man whose hand and oath cannot be taken, may not be in trust, especially in places concerning his Majesty. The plaintiff hath a loss personal and real, and engaged himself in many thousand pounds for the obtaining of money; therefore I fine Bagg 500*l.* damages to Sir Anthony Pell.

A SPEECH

DELIVERED IN THE

STARR-CHAMBER,

ON WEDNESDAY, THE

xiv. of IUNE MDCXXXVII.

AT THE CENSURE,

Of { *Iohn Baſtwick,*
Henry Burton, &
William Prinn;

Concerning *pretended Innovations*

In the CHURCH.

By the most Reverend Father in GOD,

WILLIAM,

Arch Bishop of *Canterbury* his *Grace.*

LONDON:
Printed by RICHARD BADGER.
MDCXXXVII.

[*This Speech has been collated with the original edition, the pages of which are inserted in the text in brackets. The figures in the margin mark the pages of the second volume of Laud's Works, Lond.* 1700, *in which it was reprinted.*]

TO HIS MOST SACRED MAJESTY,

CHARLES,

BY THE GRACE OF GOD, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND IRELAND, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, &c.

Most Gracious and Dread Sovereign,

I HAD no purpose to come in print, but your Majesty commands it, and I obey. Most sorry I am for the occasion that induced me to speak, and that since hath moved you to command me to print. Nor am I ignorant that many things, while they are spoken and pass by the ear but once, give great content; which when they come to the eyes of men, and their often scanning, may lie open to some exceptions. This may fall to my lot in this particular, and very easily, considering my many diversions, and the little time I could snatch from other employment to attend this. Yet choose I rather to obey your Majesty, than to sacrifice to mine own privacy and content.

Since then this Speech uttered in public in the Star-Chamber must now come to be more public in print; I humbly desire your sacred Majesty to protect me and it from the undeserved calumny of those men, 'whose mouths are spears and arrows, and their tongues a sharp sword,' Psal. lvii. 4. Though, as the wise man speaks, 'their foolish mouths have already called for their own stripes, and their lips' (and pens) 'been a snare for their souls,' Prov. xviii. 6, 7.

The occasion which led me to this speech is known. There have of late been divers libels spread against the prelates of this Church. And they have not been more bitter, which is the shame of these 'raging waves [a],' than they are utterly false,

[a] Jude, ver. 13.

which is our happiness. But I must humbly beseech your Majesty to consider, that 'tis not we only, that is, the Bishops, 64 that are struck at, but, through our sides, your Majesty, your honour, your safety, your religion, is impeached. For what safety can you expect, if you lose the hearts of your people? And how can you retain their hearts, if you change their religion into superstition? And what honour can you hope for, either present, or derivative to posterity, if you attend your government no better than to suffer your prelates to put this change upon you? And what majesty can any prince retain, if he lose his honour and his people?

God be thanked 'tis in all points otherwise with you: for God hath blessed you with a religious heart, and not subject to change. And he hath filled you with honour in the eyes of your people: and by their love and dutifulness he hath made you safe. So that your Majesty is upheld, and your crown flourishing in the eyes of Christendom. And God forbid any libellous blast at home from the tongues or pens of a few, should shrivel up any growth of these.

We have received, and daily do receive from God, many and great blessings by you: and I hope they are not many that are unthankful to you, or to God for you. And that there should be none in a populous nation, even enemies to their own happiness, cannot be expected. Yet I shall desire even these to call themselves to an account, and to remember that blasphemy against God, and 'slandering the footsteps of His anointed,' are joined together, Psal. lxxxix.[b] For he that blasphemes God will never stick at the slander of his prince; and he that gives himself the liberty to slander his prince, will quickly ascend to the next highest, and blaspheme God.

But then, as I desire them to remember, so I do most humbly beseech your Majesty to account with yourself too: and not to measure your people's love by the unworthiness of those few. For a loyal and obedient people you have, and such as will spare nor livelihood, nor life, to do you service; and are joyed at the heart to see the moderation of your

[b] Psal. lxxxix. 50. "Wherewith thine enemies have blasphemed Thee, and slandered the footsteps of thine anointed."

government, and your constancy to maintain religion, and your piety in exampling it.

And as I thus beseech you for your people in general, so do I particularly for the three professions which have a little suffered in these three most notorious libellers' persons.

And first for my own profession, I humbly beg of your Majesty to think Mr. Burton hath not in this many followers, and am heartily sorry he would needs lead. The best is, your Majesty knows what made his rancour swell[c]; I'll say no more.

And for the law, I truly honour it with my heart, and believe Mr. Prynn may seek all the Inns of Court, (and with a candle too if he will,) and scarce find such a malevolent as himself against State and Church. And because he hath so frequently thrust mistaken law into these pamphlets, to wrong the governors of the Church, and abuse your good and well-minded people, and makes Burton and Bastwick utter law which, God knows, they understand not (for I doubt his pen is in all the pamphlets), I do humbly, in the Church's name, desire of your Majesty, that it may be resolved by all the reverend Judges of England, and then published by your Majesty, that our keeping courts, and issuing process in our own names, and the like exceptions formerly taken, and now renewed, are not against the laws of the realm (as 'tis most certain they are not), that so the church-governors may go on cheerfully in their duty, and the people's minds be quieted by this assurance, that neither the law, nor their liberty as subjects, is thereby infringed[d].

And for physic, the profession is honourable and safe; and I know the professors of it will remember that *corpus humanum,* man's body, is that, about which their art is conversant, not *corpus ecclesiasticum,* or *politicum,* the body of the Church, State or Commonwealth. Bastwick only hath been bold that way. But the proverb in the Gospel, in the fourth of St. Luke, is all I'll say to him: *Medice, cura teipsum;* 'Physician, heal thyself[e].' And yet let me tell your Majesty, I believe

[c] [He had been Clerk of the Closet to the King, when Prince, and expected to have been continued in the same office on his accession to the crown.]

[d] [Such a Proclamation was subsequently issued. See Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. p. 536.]

[e] St. Luke iv. 23.

he hath gained more by making the Church a patient, than by all the patients he ever had beside.

Sir, both myself and my brethren have been very coarsely used by the tongues and pens of these men, yet shall I never give your Majesty any sour counsel; I shall rather magnify your clemency, that proceeded with these offenders in a court of mercy as well as justice: since (as the reverend Judges then declared) you might have justly called the offenders into another court, and put them to it in a way that might have exacted their lives, for their stirring (as 66
much as in them lay) of mutiny and sedition.

Yet this I shall be bold to say, and your Majesty may consider of it in your wisdom, that one way of government is not always either fit or safe, when the humours of the people are in a continual change: especially, when such men as these shall work upon your people, and labour to infuse into them such malignant principles, to introduce a parity in the Church or commonwealth. *Et si non satis sua sponte insaniant, instigare* [f]; and to spur on such among them as are too sharply set already: and by this means make and prepare all advantages for the Roman party to scorn us, and pervert them.

I pray God bless your Majesty, your royal consort, and your hopeful posterity, that you may live in happiness; govern with wisdom; support your people by justice; relieve them by mercy; defend them by power and success; and guide them in the true religion by your laws and most religious example, all the long and lasting days of your life: which are and shall be the daily prayers of

Your sacred Majesty's most loyal Subject, and

Most dutiful Servant, as most bound,

W. CANT.

[f] [Terent. And. iv. 2. 9.]

(1) My Lords,

I shall not need to speak of the infamous course of libelling in any kind: nor of the punishment of it, which in some cases was capital by the imperial laws; as appears, Cod. lib. ix. t. xxxvi.[g]: nor how patiently some great men, very great men indeed, have borne *animo civili* (that's Sueton. his word[h]) *laceratam existimationem*, the tearing and rending of their credit and repu(2)tation, with a gentle, nay, a generous mind.

But of all libels, they are most odious which pretend religion: as if that of all things did desire to be defended by 'a mouth that is like an open sepulchre,' or by a pen that is made of a sick and a loathsome quill.

There were times when persecutions were great in the Church, even to exceed barbarity itself: did any martyr or confessor, in those times, libel the governors? Surely no; not one of them to my best remembrance: yet these complain of persecution without all show of cause; and in the meantime libel and rail without all measure. So little of kin are they to those which 'suffer for Christ,' or the least part of Christian religion.

My Lords, it is not every man's (3) spirit to hold up against the venom which libellers spit. For S. Ambrose, who was a stout and a worthy prelate, tells us, not that himself, but that a far greater man than he, that's King David, had found out (so it seems in his judgment 'twas no matter of ordinary ability) *grande inventum*, a great and mighty invention, how to swallow and put off those bitter contumelies of the tongue[i]: and those of the pen are no whit less, and spread further. And it was a great one indeed, and well beseemed the greatness of David. But I think it will be far better for me to look upward, and practise it, than to look downward, and discourse upon it.

[g] [Col. 852. Col. Allob. 1624.]
[h] In Jul. c. 75. [p. 88. Lugd. Bat. 1672.]
[i] In Apol. i. David. c. vi. [§ 31. Op., tom. i. col. 685.]

In the meantime I shall remember what an ancient, under 6 the name of S. Hierom, tells me, *Indignum est et præposterum*[k], 'Tis unworthy in itself, and pre(4)postérous in demeanour, for a man to be ashamed for doing good, because other men glory in speaking ill.

And I can say it clearly and truly, as in the presence of God, I have done nothing, as a prelate, to the uttermost of what I am conscious, but with a single heart, and with a sincere intention for the good government and honour of the Church, and the maintenance of the orthodox truth and religion of Christ, professed, established, and maintained in this Church of England.

For my care of this Church, the reducing of it into order, the upholding of the external worship of God in it, and the settling of it to the rules of its first reformation, are the causes (and the sole causes, whatever are pretended) of all this malicious storm, which hath lowered so black upon me, and some (5) of my brethren. And in the meantime, they which are the only, or the chief innovators of the Christian world, having nothing to say, accuse us of innovation; they themselves and their complices in the meantime being the greatest innovators that the Christian world hath almost ever known. I deny not but others have spread more dangerous errors in the Church of Christ; but no men, in any age of it, have been more guilty of innovation than they, while themselves cry out against it. *Quis tulerit Gracchos?*

And I said well, *Quis tulerit Gracchos?* For 'tis most apparent to any man that will not wink, that the intention of these men, and their abettors, was and is to raise a sedition, being as great incendiaries in the State (where they get power) as they have ever been in the (6) Church; Novatian himself hardly greater.

Our main crime is (would they all speak out, as some of them do), that we are bishops[l]; were we not so, some of us might be as passable as other men.

[k] ["O quam indignum est atque præposterum, ut justi confundantur in bonis, et peccatores glorientur in malis."]—Ad Ocean. de Ferend. Op-prob. [S. Hieron. Op., tom. xi. col. 366. D. inter Opera spuria.]

[l] Burton's Apol. [of an Appeal,] p. 110. [Lond. 1636. The passage is in the 'Summe of two Sermons,' entitled, 'For God and the King,' appended to the Apology.]

And a great trouble 'tis to them, that we maintain that our calling of bishops is *jure divino*, by divine right: of this I have said enough, and in this place, in Leighton's case, nor will I repeat. Only this I will say, and abide by it, that the calling of bishops is *jure divino*, by divine right, though not all adjuncts to their calling. And this I say in as direct opposition to the Church of Rome, as to the Puritan humour.

And I say further, that from the Apostles' times, in all ages, in all places, the Church of Christ was governed by bishops: and lay-elders never heard (7) of, till Calvin's new-fangled device at Geneva.

Now this is made by these men, as if it were *contra Regem*, against the King, in right or in power.

But that's a mere ignorant shift; for our being bishops *jure divino*, by divine right, takes nothing from the King's right or power over us. For though our office be from God and Christ immediately, yet may we not exercise that power, either of order or jurisdiction, but as God hath appointed us, that is, not in his Majesty's or any Christian king's kingdoms, but by and under the power of the King given us so to do.

And were this a good argument against us, as bishops, it must needs be good against priests and ministers too; for
59 themselves grant that (8) their calling is *jure divino*, by divine right; and yet I hope they will not say, that to be priests and ministers is against the King, or any his royal prerogatives.

Next, suppose our calling, as bishops, could not be made good *jure divino*, by divine right, yet *jure ecclesiastico*, by ecclesiastical right, it cannot be denied. And here in England the bishops are confirmed, both in their power and means, by Act of Parliament. So that here we stand in as good case as the present laws of the realm can make us. And so we must stand till the laws shall be repealed by the same power that made them.

Now then, suppose we had no other string to hold by, (I say suppose this, but I grant it not,) yet no man (9) can libel against our calling, (as these men do,) be it in pulpit, print, or otherwise, but he libels against the King and the State, by whose laws we are established. Therefore, all these libels, so far forth as they are against our calling, are against the

King and the law, and can have no other purpose than to stir up sedition among the people.

If these men had any other intention, or if they had any Christian or charitable desire to reform anything amiss, why did they not modestly petition his Majesty about it, that in his princely wisdom he might set all things right, in a just and orderly manner? But this was neither their intention nor way. For one clamours out of his pulpit, and all of them from the press, and in a most viru(10)lent and unchristian manner set themselves to make a heat among the people; and so by mutiny to effect that which by law they cannot; and by most false and unjust calumnies to defame both our callings and persons. But for my part, as I pity their rage, so I heartily pray God to forgive their malice.

No nation hath ever appeared more jealous of religion than the people of England have ever been. And their zeal to God's glory hath been, and at this day is a great honour to them. But this zeal of theirs hath not been at all times and in all persons alike guided by knowledge. Now zeal, as it is of excellent use, where it sees its way, so it is very dangerous company where it goes on in the (11) dark[m]: and these men, knowing the disposition of the people, have laboured nothing more than to misinform their knowledge, and misguide their zeal, and so to fire that into a sedition, in hope that they whom they causelessly hate might miscarry in it.

For the main scope of these libels is to kindle a jealousy in men's minds that there are some great plots in hand, dangerous plots, (so says Mr. Burton expressly[n],) to change the orthodox religion established in England, and to bring in, I know not what, Romish superstition in the room of it. As if the external decent worship of God could not be upheld in this kingdom, with(12)out bringing in of Popery.

Now, by this art of theirs, give me leave to tell you that the King is most desperately abused and wounded in the minds of his people, and the prelates shamefully.

[m] You may see it in the example of S. Paul himself, whose very zeal in the darkness of his understanding, which he then had, made him persecute Christ and his Church, Acts xxii. 3, 4. And he was very dangerous company then; for he breathed out threatenings against the disciples, Acts ix. 1. So true is that of Saint Greg. Naz. Orat. xxi.: *Zelus iracundiam acuit:* All zeal puts an edge to anger itself: and that must needs be dangerous in the dark.

[n] [Burton's Humble Appeal,] page 5. [Lond. 1636.]

0 The King most desperately: for there is not a more cunning trick in the world, to withdraw the people's hearts from their sovereign, than to persuade them that he is changing true religion, and about to bring in gross superstition upon them.

And the prelates shamefully: for they are charged to seduce, and lay the plot, and be the instruments.

For his Majesty first. This I know, and upon this occasion take it my duty to speak: there is no prince in Christendom more sincere in his religion, nor more constant to it, than the (13) King. And he gave such a testimony of this at his being in Spain, as I much doubt whether the best of that faction durst have done half so much as his Majesty did, in the face of that kingdom. And this you, my Lord, the Earl of Holland, and other persons of honour, were eye and ear witnesses of, having the happiness to attend him there. And at this day, as his Majesty (by God's great blessing both on him and us) knows more, so is he more settled and more confirmed, both in the truth of the religion here established, and in resolution to maintain it.

And for the prelates; I assure myself they cannot be so base, as to live prelates in the Church of England, and labour to bring in the superstitions of the Church of Rome upon themselves and it. And if any should be so foul, I (14) do not only leave him to God's judgment, but (if these libellers, or any other, can discover that his base and irreligious falsehood) to shame also, and severe punishment from the State: and in any just way, no man's hand shall be more or sooner against him, than mine shall be.

And for myself, to pass by all the scandalous reproaches which they have most injuriously cast upon me, I shall say this only:

First, I know of no plot nor purpose of altering the religion established.

Secondly, I have ever been far from attempting anything that may truly be said to tend that way in the least degree: and to these two I here offer my oath.

Thirdly, if the King had a mind to change religion, (which I know he (15) hath not, and God forbid he should ever have,) he must seek for other instruments. For as basely as these men conceive of me, yet I thank God, I know my duty

well, both to God and the King: and I know that all the duty I owe to the King is under God. And my great happiness it is (though not mine alone, but your Lordships' and all his subjects' with me), that we live under a gracious and a religious King, that will ever give us leave to serve God first, and him next. But were the days otherwise, I thank Christ for it, I yet know not how to serve any man against the truth of God, and I hope I shall never learn it.

But to return to the business; what is their art to make the world believe a change of religion is endeavoured? What? Why forsooth, they say, (16) there are great innovations brought in by the prelates, and such as tend to the advancing of Popery.

Now, that the vanity and falsehood of this may appear, I shall humbly desire your Lordships to give me leave to recite briefly all the innovations charged upon us, be they of less or greater moment, and as briefly to answer them. And then 7
you shall clearly see, whether any cause hath been given of these unsavoury libels, and withal, whether there be any show of cause to fear a change of religion. And I will take these great pretended innovations in order, as I meet with them.

First, I begin with the 'News from Ipswich[o].'

Where the FIRST INNOVATION is, 'that the last year's fast was enjoined to be (17) without sermons in London, the suburbs, and other infected places, contrary to the orders for other fasts in former times: whereas sermons are the only means to humble men[p],' &c.

To this I say, first, that an after-age may, without offence, learn to avoid any visible inconvenience observed in the former. And there was visible inconvenience observed in men's former flocking to sermons in infected places.

Secondly, this was no particular act of prelates; but the business was debated at the Council-table, being a matter of State as well as of religion. And it was concluded for no sermons in those infected places, upon this reason, that infected persons or families, known in their own parishes, might not take occasion upon those (18) by-days to run to

[o] [This book was written by Prynne, under the name of Matthew White, and was specially directed against the proceedings of Bishop Wren.]

[p] Page 2.

other churches where they were not known, as many use to do, to hear some humorous men preach; for on the Sundays, when they better kept their own churches, the danger is not so great altogether.

Nor, thirdly, is that true, that sermons are the only means to humble men. For though the preaching of God's word, where it is performed according to His ordinance, be a great means of many good effects in the souls of men, yet no sermons are the only means to humble men. And some of their sermons are fitter a great deal for other operations: namely, to stir up sedition, as you may see by Mr. Burton's; for this his printed libel was a sermon first, and a libel too. And 'tis the best part of a fast to abstain from such sermons.

(19) 2. The SECOND INNOVATION is, 'that Wednesday was appointed for the fast-day, and that this was done with this intention, by the example of this fast without preaching, to suppress all the Wednesday lectures in London[q].'

To this I answer, first, that the appointing of Wednesday for the fast-day was no innovation. For it was the day in the last fast before this: and I myself remember it so, above forty years since, more than once.

Secondly, if there be any innovation in it, the prelates named not the day; my Lord Keeper, I must appeal to your Lordship: the day was first named by your Lordship, as the usual and fittest day. And yet I dare say, and swear too, that your Lordship had no aim to bring in Popery; nor to suppress all or any the Wednesday lectures (20) in London. Besides, these men live to see the fast ended, and no one Wednesday lecture suppressed.

72 3. The THIRD INNOVATION is, 'that the prayer for seasonable weather was purged out of this last fast-book, which was,' say they, 'one cause of shipwrecks and tempestuous weather[r].'

To this I say, first in the general; this fast-book, and all that have formerly been made, have been both made and published by the command of the King, in whose sole power it is to call a fast. And the archbishop and bishops to whom the ordering of the book is committed, have power under the King to put in or leave out whatsoever they think fit for the

[q] Page 3. [r] Page 3.

present occasion; as their predecessors have ever done before them. (21) Provided that nothing be in contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England.

And this may serve in the general for all alterations, in that or any other fast-book, or books of devotion upon any particular occasions, which may and ought to vary with several times; and we may, and do, and will justify, under his Majesty's power, all such alterations made therein.

Secondly, for the particular. When this last book was set out, the weather was very seasonable. And it is not the custom of the Church, nor fit in itself, to pray for seasonable weather when we have it, but when we want it. When the former book was set out, the weather was extreme ill, and the harvest in danger; now (22) the harvest was in, and the weather good.

Thirdly, 'tis most inconsequent to say, that the leaving that prayer out of the book of devotions caused the shipwrecks and the tempests which followed. And as bold they are with God Almighty, in saying it was the cause: for sure I am, God never told them that was the cause. And if God never revealed it, they cannot come to know it; yet had the bishops been prophets, and foreseen these accidents, they would certainly have prayed against them.

Fourthly, had any minister found it necessary to use this prayer at any one time during the fast, he might with ease and without danger have supplied that want, by using that prayer to the same purpose which is in the ordinary Liturgy.

(23) Fifthly, I humbly desire your Lordships to weigh well the consequence of this great and dangerous innovation. The prayer for fair weather was left out of the book for the fast; therefore the prelates intend to bring in Popery. An excellent consequence, were there any show of reason in it.

4. The FOURTH INNOVATION is, 'that there is one very useful collect left out, and a clause omitted in another[a].'

To this I answer, first, as before; it was lawful for us to alter what we thought fit.

And secondly, since that collect made mention of preaching, and the Act of State forbad sermons on the fast-days in

[a] Page 3.

infected places, we thought it fit, in pursuance of that order, to leave out that collect.

73 (24) And thirdly, for the branch in the other, which is the first collect, though God did deliver our forefathers out of 'Romish superstition,' yet (God be blessed for it) we were never in. And therefore that clause being unfittingly expressed, we thought fit to pass it over[t].

5. The FIFTH INNOVATION is, 'that in the sixth order for the fast, there is a passage left out concerning the abuse of fasting in relation to merit[u].'

To this I answer, that he to whom the ordering of that book to the press was committed, did therefore leave it out, because in this age and kingdom there is little opinion of meriting by fasting.

Nay, on the contrary, the contempt and scorn of all fasting (save what humorous men call for of themselves) is (25) so rank, that it would grieve any Christian man to see the necessary orders of the Church concerning fasting, both in Lent and at other set times, so vilified as they are.

6. The SIXTH INNOVATION is, 'that the Lady Elizabeth and her princely children are dashed' (that 's their phrase) 'out of the new collect, whereas they were in the collect of the former book[x].'

For this first, the author of the 'News' knows full well that they are left out of the collect in the latter editions of the Common Prayer-book, as well as in the book for the fast. And this was done according to the course of the Church, which ordinarily names none in the prayer but the right line descending. Yet this was not done till the King himself commanded it; as I have (26) to show under his Majesty's hand.

Secondly, I beseech your Lordships to consider, what must be the consequence here: The Queen of Bohemia and her children are left out of the collect; therefore the prelates intend to bring in Popery; for 'that,' you know, they say, 'is the end of all these innovations.' Now, if this be the end and the consequence, truly the libellers have done very duti-

[t] [The passage is quoted in Prynne's Cant. Doom, p 249.]

[u] Page 3. [The passage is quoted in Prynne's Cant. Doom, p. 250.]

[x] Page 3.

fully to the King, to poison his people with this conceit; that the Lady Elizabeth and her children would keep Popery out of this kingdom, but the King and his children will not. And many as good offices as these have they done the King quite through these libels, and quite through his kingdoms. For my part, I honour the Queen of Bohemia and her line as much as any man whatsoever, and shall be as ready (27) to serve them; but I know not how to depart from my allegiance, as I doubt these men have done.

7. The SEVENTH INNOVATION is, 'that these words, 'who art the Father of Thine elect and of their seed,' are changed in the preface of that collect which is for the Prince and the King's children[y].' And with a most spiteful inference, 'that this was done by the prelates to exclude the King's children out of the number of God's elect.' And they call it 'an intolerable impiety and horrid treason.'

To this I answer, first, that this alteration was made in my predecessor's time, before I had any authority to meddle with these things, further than I was called upon by him.

Secondly, this is not therefore to lay any aspersion upon 74
my predecessor, for (28) he did in that but his duty: for his Majesty acknowledges it was done by his special direction, as having then no children to pray for.

And thirdly, this collect could not be very old, for it had no being in the Common Prayer-book all Queen Elizabeth's time, she having no issue.

The truth is, it was made at the coming in of King James, and must of necessity be changed over and over again, *pro ratione temporum*, as times and persons vary. And this is the 'intolerable impiety and horrid treason' they charge upon us.

In this method the innovations are set down in the 'News from Ipswich.' But then in Mr. Burton's News from Friday-street (called his 'Apology[z]') they are in another order, and more are added. Therefore, with your Lord(29)ships' leave, I will not repeat any of these, but go on to the rest, which Mr. Burton adds.

[y] Page 3.

[z] [Burton's 'Apology of an Appeal.' There is not a second title, 'News from Friday-street.']

8. The EIGHTH INNOVATION is, 'that in the Epistle the Sunday before Easter, we have put out 'in,' and made it 'at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow;' which alteration,' he saith, 'is directly against the Act of Parliament[a].'

Here give me leave to tell you, 'tis 'at the name of Jesus,' in the late learned translation made in King James his time. About which many learned men of best note in the kingdom were employed, besides some prelates.

But to this I answer, first, 'tis true the Common Prayer-book was confirmed by Act of Parliament, and so all things contained in it at the passing of that Act. But I hope if anything were false-(30)printed then, the Parliament did not intend to pass those slips for current.

Secondly, I am not of opinion, that if one word be put in for another, so they bear both the same sense, that there is any great matter done against the Act of Parliament.

Thirdly, this can make no innovation. For 'in the name,' and 'at the name of Jesus,' can make no essential difference here. And Mr. Pryn (whose darling business it hath long been to cry down the honour due to the Son of God, at the mention of His saving name Jesus) knows the grammar rule well, 'In a place, or at a place,' &c.

Fourthly, if there were any error in the change of 'in' into 'at,' I do here solemnly protest to you I know not how it came: for authority from the pre(31)lates the printers had none, and such a word is easily changed in such a negligent press as we have in England. Or if any altered it purposely, for aught I know, they did it to gratify the preciser sort. For therein they followed the Geneva translation, and printed at Geneva, 1557[b], where the words are, 'at the name of Jesus.' And that is ninety-four years ago, and therefore no innovation made by us.

Fifthly, this I find in the Queen's Injunctions, without either word 'in' or 'at.' 'Whensoever the name of Jesus shall be in any lesson, sermon, or otherwise, pronounced in the church,' 'tis enjoined, 'that due reverence be made of all persons, young and old, with lowliness of courtesy, and uncovering of the heads of the men-kind, as thereunto doth

[a] Burton's Apology, pag. 2.

[b] In octavo.

necessarily belong, and heretofore hath been accustomed[c].' (32) So here is necessity laid upon it, and custom for it, and both expressed by authority in the very beginning of the Reformation, and is therefore no innovation now.

9. The NINTH INNOVATION is[d], 'that two places are changed 75
in the prayers set forth for the fifth of November: and ordered to be read,' they say, 'by Act of Parliament. The first place is changed thus: from, 'Root out that Babylonish and antichristian sect which say of Jerusalem,' &c., into this form of words, 'Root out that Babylonish and antichristian sect (of them) which say,' &c. The second place went thus in the old: 'Cut off these workers of iniquity, whose religion is rebellion;' but in the book printed 1635, 'tis thus altered: 'Cut off those workers of iniquity, who turn religion into rebellion,'' &c.

(33) To this I say, first, 'tis a notorious untruth that this book was 'ordered to be read by Act of Parliament.' The Act of Parliament, indeed, is printed before it; and therein is a command for prayers and thanksgivings every fifth of November, but not one word or syllable for the form of prayer: that's left to the Church. Therefore, here's no innovation against that Act of Parliament.

Secondly, the alteration first mentioned, that is, 'that sect,' or 'sect of them,' is of so small consequence as 'tis not worth the speaking of; besides, if there be anything of moment in it, 'tis answered in the next.

Thirdly, both for that and the second place, which seems of more moment; and so for the rest, not only in that book, but that other also for his Majesty's coronation, his Majesty expressly (34) commanded me to make the alterations, and see them printed. And here are both the books, with his Majesty's warrant to each of them. So that herein I conceive I did not offend, unless it were that I gave not these men notice of it, or asked them leave to obey the King.

Against this there can be but two objections, should malice itself go to work. The one is, that I moved his Majesty to command the change; and the other, that now, when I saw

[c] Injunction lii. [Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. p. 188.]

[d] Page 3.

myself challenged for it, I procured his Majesty's hand for my security.

To these I answer clearly, first, that I did not move the King, directly or indirectly, to make this change.

And, secondly, that I had his Majesty's hand to the book, not now, but then, and before ever I caused them (35) to be printed as now they are. And that both these are true, I here again freely offer myself to my oath.

And yet, fourthly, that you may see his gracious Majesty used not his power only in commanding this change, but his wisdom also, I shall adventure to give you my reasons, such as they are, why this alteration was most fit, if not necessary.

My first reason is, in the Litany in Henry VIII. his time[e], and also under Edward VI.[f], there was this clause: 'From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, from all false doctrine, &c., Good Lord, deliver us.' But in the Litany in Queen Elizabeth's time, this clause about the Pope was left out, and it seems of purpose, for avoiding of scandal: and yet the prelates for (36) that not accounted innovators, or introducers of Popery. Now 'tis a far greater scandal to call their religion 'rebellion' than 'tis to call their chief bishop 'tyrant.'

76 And this reason is drawn from scandal, which must ever be avoided as much as it may.

My second reason is, that the learned make but three religions to have been of old in the world, Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity; and now they have added a fourth, which is Turcism, and is an absurd mixture of the other three. Now, if this ground of theirs be true, (as 'tis generally received,) perhaps it will be of dangerous consequence sadly to avow that the Popish religion is rebellion. That some opinions of theirs teach rebelli(37)on, that's apparently true; the other would be thought on, to say no more. And this reason, well weighed, is taken from the very foundations of religion itself.

My third reason is, because if you make their religion to be rebellion, then you make their religion and rebellion to be

[e] It was put into the Litany of Hen. VIII.'s time, as appears in his Primer, with his injunction before it.

[f] And 'tis in both the Service-books of Edw. VI., both that which was printed 1549, and in that which was after, anno 1552.

all one. And that is against the ground both of state and the law. For when divers Romish priests and Jesuits have deservedly suffered death for treason, is it not the constant and just profession of the State, that they never put any man to death for religion, but for rebellion and treason only? Doth not the State truly affirm, that there was never any law made against the life of a Papist, *quatenus* a Papist only? And (38) is not all this stark false, if their very religion be rebellion? For if their religion be rebellion, it is not only false, but impossible, that the same man, in the same act, should suffer for his rebellion, and not for his religion.

And this King James of ever-blessed memory understood passing well, when, in his Premonition to all Christian Monarchs, he saith, 'I do constantly maintain that no Papist, either in my time or in the time of the late Queen, ever died for his conscience[g].' Therefore, he did not think their very religion was rebellion; though this clause passed through inadvertency in his time. And this reason is grounded both upon the practice and the justice of the law.

Which of these reasons, or whe(39)ther any other better, were in his Majesty's thoughts when he commanded the alteration of this clause, I know not. But I took it my duty to lay it before you, that the King had not only power, but reason to command it.

10. The TENTH INNOVATION is, 'that the Prayer for the Navy is left out of the late book for the fast[h].'

To this I say, there is great reason it should. For the King had no declared enemy then, nor (God be thanked) hath he now. Nor had he then any navy at sea; for almost all the ships were come in before the fast-book was set out.

But, howsoever, an excellent consequence it is, if you mark it: The Prayer for the Navy was left out of the (40) book for the fast; therefore by that, and such like innovations, the prelates intend to bring in Popery. Indeed, if that were a piece of the prelates' plots to bring in Popery from beyond sea, then they were mightily overseen that they left out the Prayer for the Navy. But else what reason or consequence is in it I know not, unless perhaps Mr. Burton intended to

[g] [Works,] page 336. [h] Page 3.

befriend Dr. Bastwick, and in the navy bring hither the Whore of Babylon to be ready for his christening, as he most profanely scoffs.

Well; I pray God the time come not upon this kingdom, in which it will be found that no one thing hath advanced or ushered in Popery so fast, as the gross absurdities even in the worship of God which (41) these men, and their like, maintain, both in opinion and practice.

11. The ELEVENTH INNOVATION is, 'the reading of the second service at the communion-table, or the altar[i].'

To this, first, I can truly say, that since my own memory this was in use in very many places, as being most proper (for those prayers are then read which both precede and follow the Communion); and by little and little this ancient custom was altered, and in those places first where the emissaries of this faction came to preach. And now, if any in authority offer to reduce it, this ancient course of the Church is by and by called an innovation.

Secondly, with this the Rubrics of the Common Prayer-book agree; (42) for the first Rubric after the Communion tells us, that upon holidays, though there be no Communion, yet all else that 's appointed at the Communion shall be read. Shall be read? That's true; but where? Why, the last Rubric before the Communion tells us, 'that the priest, standing at the north side of the holy table, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with that which follows.' So that not only the Communion, but the prayers which accompany the Communion (which are commonly called the Second Service), are to be read at the communion-table. Therefore, if this be an innovation, 'tis made by the Rubric, not by the prelates. And Mr. Burton's scoff, that this 'second service must be served in for dainties[k],' savours too much of belly and profanation.

(43) 12. One thing sticks much in their stomachs, and they call it an INNOVATION too; and that is, 'bowing, or doing reverence at our first coming into the church, or at our nearer approaches to the holy table, or the altar,' (call it

[i] [Burton's Sermon for God and the King,] page 105.

[k] Page 105: "Then the second service, as dainties, must be said there."

whether you will;) in which they will needs have it, 'that we worship the holy table, or God knows what[l].'

To this I answer, first, that God forbid we should worship anything but God Himself.

Secondly, that if to worship God when we enter into His house, or approach His altar, be an innovation, 'tis a very old one.

For Moses did reverence at the very door of the Tabernacle (Numb. xx. 6)[m]; Hezekiah, and all that (44) were present with him, when they had made an end of offering, bowed and worshipped (2 Chron. xxix. 29); David calls the people to it with a *Venite*, 'O come, let us worship and fall down, and kneel before the Lord our Maker' (Psal. xcv. 6). And in all these places (I pray, mark it) 'tis bodily worship.

Nor can they say, that this was Judaical worship, and now not to be imitated; for long before Judaism began, Bethel, the house of God, was a place of reverence (Gen. xxviii. 17, &c.); therefore, certainly, of and to God.

And after Judaical worship ended, *Venite, adoremus*, as far upwards as there is any track of a liturgy, was the *introitus* of the priest, all the Latin Church over.

And in the daily prayers of the (45) Church of England, 78
this was retained at the Reformation; and that Psalm, in which is *Venite, adoremus*, is commanded to begin the Morning Service every day. And for aught I know, the priest may as well leave out the *Venite*, as the *Adoremus;* the calling the people to their duty, as the duty itself when they are come.

Therefore, even according to the Service-book of the Church of England, the priest and the people both are called upon for external and bodily reverence and worship of God in His church. Therefore, they which do it do not innovate. And yet the government is so moderate, (God grant it be not too loose therewhile,) that no man is constrained, no man questioned, only religiously called upon, *Venite, adoremus*, 'Come, let us worship.'

(46) For my own part, I take myself bound to worship with body as well as in soul, whenever I come where God is

[l] Page 105.

[m] [Prynne has commented very scurrilously on this and the following paragraphs, which relate to the twelfth innovation, in Cant. Doom, pp. 200, 201.]

worshipped. And were this kingdom such as would allow no holy table standing in its proper place, (and such places some there are,) yet I would worship God when I came into His house. And were the times such as should beat down churches, and all the 'curious carved work thereof, with axes and hammers,' as in Psal. lxxiv. 6, (and such times have been,) yet would I worship in what place soever I came to pray, though there were not so much as a stone laid for Bethel. But this is the misery, 'tis superstition now-a-days for any man to come with more reverence into a church, than a tinker and his bitch come into an ale-house. The (47) comparison is too homely, but my just indignation at the profaneness of the times makes me speak it.

And you, my honourable Lords of the Garter, in your great solemnities, you do your reverence, and to Almighty God, I doubt not; but yet it is *versus altare*, 'towards His altar,' as the greatest place of God's residence upon earth. (I say the greatest, yea, greater than the pulpit; for there 'tis *Hoc est corpus meum*, 'This is My body;' but in the pulpit 'tis at most but *Hoc est verbum meum*, 'This is My word.' And a greater reverence, no doubt, is due to the body than to the word of our Lord. And so, in relation, answerably to the throne where His body is usually present, than to the seat whence His word useth to be proclaimed. And (48) God hold it there, at His word; for, as too many men use the matter, 'tis *Hoc est verbum Diaboli*, 'This is the word of the Devil,' in too many places. Witness sedition, and the like to it.) And this reverence ye do when ye enter the chapel, and when you approach nearer to offer. And this is no innovation, for you are bound to it by your order, and that's not new.

And idolatry it is not to worship God towards His holy table; for if it had been idolatry, I presume Queen Elizabeth and King James would not have practised it, no not in those solemnities. And being not idolatry, but true Divine worship, you will, I hope, give a poor priest leave to worship God as yourselves do: for if it be God's worship, (49) I ought to do it as well as you; and if it be idolatry, you ought not to do it more than I.

I say again, I hope a poor priest may worship God with as lowly reverence as you do, since you are bound by your

order, and by your oath, according to a constitution of Henry the Fifth (as appears[n]), to give due honour and reverence *Domino Deo, et altari ejus, in modum virorum ecclesias-* 79
ticorum; that is, 'to the Lord your God, and to His altar,' (for there is a reverence due to that too, though such as comes far short of Divine worship;) and this 'in the manner as ecclesiastical persons both worship and do reverence.'

The story which led in this decree is this: King Henry the Fifth, that noble and victorious prince, return(50)ing gloriously out of France, sat at this solemnity; and finding the knights of the Order scarce bow to God, or but slightly, and then bow towards him and his seat, startled at it, (being a prince then grown as religious as he was before victorious;) and after asking the reason, for till then the knights of the Order never bowed toward the King or his seat, the Duke of Bedford answered, it was settled by a Chapter Act three years before. Hereupon that great King replied: 'No; I'll none of this, till you the knights do it *satis bene*, well enough, and with due performance, to Almighty God.' And hereupon the forenamed Act proceeded, that they should do 'this duty to Almighty God,' not slightly, but *ad modum virorum ecclesiasticorum*, 'as low, as well, as decently as clergymen use to do it.'

(51) Now, if you will turn this off, and say it was the superstition of that age so to do, Bishop Jewell will come in to help me there. For where Harding names divers ceremonies, and particularly bowing themselves and adoring at the Sacrament,—I say, 'adoring at the Sacrament,' not 'adoring the Sacrament,'—there Bishop Jewell (that learned, painful, and reverend prelate) approves all, both the kneeling and the bowing, and the standing up at the Gospel, (which, as ancient as it is in the Church, and a common custom, is yet fondly made another of their innovations;) and further, the Bishop adds, 'that they are all commendable gestures, and tokens of devotion, so long as the people understand what they mean, and apply them unto God[o].' Now, with us the people did (52) ever understand them fully, and apply them to God,

[n] In Libro Nigro Windesoriensi, p. 65. [See 'The Register of the most noble Order of the Garter,' &c., by John Anstis, vol. ii. p. 76.]

[o] B. Jewell's Reply to Harding's Answer, art. 3, div. 29. [p. 151. Lond. 1609.]

and to none but God, till these factious spirits, and their like, to the great disservice of God and His Church, went about to persuade them that they are superstitious, if not idolatrous gestures: as they make everything else to be, where God is not served slovenly.

13. The THIRTEENTH INNOVATION is, 'the placing of the holy table altarwise, at the upper end of the chancel,' that is, 'the setting of it north and south, and placing a rail before it,' to keep it from profanation, which Mr. Burton says, 'is done to advance and usher in Popery[p].'

To this I answer, that 'tis no Popery to set a rail to keep profanation from that holy table; nor is it (53) any innovation to place it at the upper end of the chancel, as the altar stood. And this appears both by the practice, and by the command and canon of the Church of England.

First, by the practice of the Church of England: for in the King's royal chapels, and divers cathedrals, the holy table hath ever since the Reformation stood at the upper end of the quire, with the large or full side towards the people.

And though it stood in most parish churches the other way, yet whether there be not more reason the parish churches should be made conformable to the cathedral and mother churches, than the cathedrals to them, I leave to any reasonable man to judge.

And yet here is nothing done, ei(54)ther by violence or
80 command, to take off the indifferency of the standing of the holy table either way, but only by laying it fairly before men, how fit it is there should be order and uniformity; I say still reserving the indifferency of the standing.

But, howsoever, I would fain know how any discreet moderate man dares say that the 'placing of the holy table altarwise' (since they will needs call it so) is done either 'to advance or usher in Popery?' For did Queen Elizabeth banish Popery, and yet did she all along her reign from first to last leave the communion-table so standing in her own Chapel Royal, in St. Paul's and Westminster, and other places, and all this of purpose to advance or usher in that Popery which she had driven out?

[p] [Apology,] pp. 4, 5, [and Sermon for God and the King, p.] 105.

(55) And since her death, have two gracious Kings kept out Popery all their times, and yet left the holy table standing as it did in the Queen's time, and all of purpose to advance or usher in Popery, which they kept out?

Or what's the matter? May the holy table stand this way in the King's chapel, or cathedrals, or Bishops' chapels, and not elsewhere? Surely, if it be decent and fit for God's service, it may stand so (if authority please) in any church. But if it 'advance or usher in any superstition and Popery,' it ought to stand so in none.

Nor hath any King's chapel any prerogative (if that may be called one) above any ordinary church to disserve God in, by any superstitious (56) rites. Where give me leave to tell you, that the King and his chapel are most jeeringly and with scorn abused, in the last leaf of Mr. Burton's mutinous Appeal, for such it is.

Secondly, this appears by the canon or rule of the Church of England too, for 'tis plain in the last Injunction of the Queen, that the holy table ought to stand at the upper end of the quire, north and south, or altarwise. For the words of the Queen's Injunctions are these:—

'The holy table in every church' (mark it, I pray, not in the Royal Chapel or cathedrals only, but 'in every church') 'shall be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood[q].' Now, the altar stood at the upper end of the quire, north and south, as (57) appears before by the practice of the Church. And there to set it otherwise is to set it cross the place, not 'in' the place where the altar stood; and so, *Stulti dum vitant vitia*[r]—weak men, as these libellers are, run into one superstition while they would avoid another; for they run upon the superstition of the cross while they seek to avoid the superstition of the altar. So you see, here's neither Popery nor innovation in all the practice of Queen Elizabeth, or since.

These words of the Injunction are so plain, as that they can admit of no shift.

And give me leave to tell you, that a very learned prelate of this Church, and one whom I think these men will not

[q] [Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. p. 188.]

[r] [Hor. Sat. i. 2. 24.]

accuse as a man like to (58) 'advance or usher in Popery,' is of the same opinion: 'tis my Lord the Bishop of Salisbury[s].

Some difference was lately rising about placing the communion-table in a parish church of his diocese. The Bishop, careful to prevent all disorder, sends his injunction[t] under his hand and seal to the curate and churchwardens, to settle that business; in which he hath these two passages remarkable. I have seen and read the order[u].

[s] [Dr. John Davenant, a divine of strong Calvinistic leanings.]

[t] May 17, 1637.

[u] [The Editor, in examining the Parish Register of Aldbourne for another purpose, most unexpectedly discovered a copy of this very document, which, by the kindness of the Rev. G. P. Cleather, M.A., Vicar of the parish, he was permitted to transcribe.

"A copy of the order sent from the Right Reverent father in God the Bishop of Sarum to the Parish of Alborne for the placing of the Holy Table, and administration of the Holy Sac. of the Lord's Supper.

"John, by divine providence Bishop of Sarum, To the Curate and Churchwardens with the Parishioners of Auborne, in the County of Wilts, and our Dioces of Sarū, greeting, Whereas his Matie hath beene lately informed, that some men factiously disposed, have taken upon themselves to place and remove the Cōmunion Table in the Church of Auborne; and thereupon his highnes hath required me to take p^rsent order therein. These are to let you know, that both according to the Iniunctions given out in the Raigne of Queene Elizabeth for the placing of Cōmunion Tables in Churches, and by the 82 Canon agreed upon in the first yeare of the Raigne of King James of blessed memory, it was intimated that those Tables should ordinarily be sett and stand with the side to the East wall of the Chauncell. I therefore require you the Churchwardens, and all other persons, not to meddle with the bringing downe or transposing of the Cōmunion Table, as you will answere it at your owne perill. And because some doe ignorantly suppose that the standing of the Cōmunion Table where Altars stood in times of supstition has some relish of Popery: And some prchance may as erroniously conceive that the placing thereof otherwise when the holy Cōmunion is administered savor^s of irreverence: I would have you take notice from the forenamed Iniunction, and Canon, from the Rubric p^refixed before the administration of the Lord's Supper, and from the first article not long since inquired of in the Visitation of our most reverend Metropolitan; that the placing of it higher or lower in the Chauncell, or in the Church, is by the iudgment of the Church of England a thing indifferent, and to be ordered and guided by the only Rule of Conveniencie. Now because in things of this nature to iudge and determine what is most cōvenient, belongs not to private persons, but to those that have Ecclesiastical authority; I inhibit you the Church-Wardens, and all other persons whatsoever, to meddle with the bringing downe of the Cōmunion Table, or with altering the place thereof at such times as the Holy Supp is to be administered; and I require you herein to yield obedience unto what is already iudged most convenient by my Chauncellor, unless upon further consideration and viewe it shall be otherwise ordered. Now to the end that the Minister may neither be overtoyled, nor the people indecently and inconveniently thronged together, when they are to draw neere, and take the holy Sacrament; and that the frequent celebratiō thereof may nevertheless be continued, I doe further appoint that thrice in the yeare at the least, there be publique notice given in the Church, for fower Cōmunions to be held upon fower Sundaies together; and that there come not to the Cōmunion in one day above two hundred at the most. For the better observation whereof, and that every man may know his prop time, the Curate shall divide the Parishioners into fower parts according to his discretiō, and as shall most fittingly serve to this

The first passage is this: 'By the Injunction of Queen Elizabeth,' saith he, 'and by Can. 82 under King James, the communion-tables should ordinarily be set and stand with the side to the east wall of the chancel.' Therefore, 81
this is no innovation, since there is injunction and canon for it.

(59) The other passage is this: ''Tis ignorance,' saith that learned Bishop, 'to think that the standing of the holy table there relishes of Popery.' Therefore, if it do not so much as relish of Popery, it can neither advance it nor usher it in. And therefore, this is a most odious slander and scandal cast upon us.

So here 's enough both for the practice and rule of the Church of England since the Reformation. Now before that time, both in this and other Churches of Christendom, in the East and West ordinarily, the holy table or altar stood so. Against this Mr. Burton says little.

But the Lincolnshire minister comes in to play the Puritan for that. Concerning which book [x] (falling thus in my way) and the (60) nameless author of it, I shall only say these two things.

The one is, that the author prevaricates from the first word to the last in the book; for he takes on him both for the name and for the placing of the holy table, and the like, to prove, that generally, and universally, and ordinarily in the whole Catholic Church, both East and West, the holy table did not stand at the upper end of the quire or chancel. And this he must prove, or he doth nothing.

Now when he comes to make his proofs, they are almost all of them particular, few or none general and concludent; for he neither brings testimonies out of the general and received rituals of the Eastern and Western Churches, nor

purpose. And if any turbulent spirit shall disobey this our order, hee shall be proceeded against according to the quality of his fault and misdemeanour. In wittnes whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seale Episcopal this seventeenth day of May, 1637. And in the yeare of our Consecration the sixteenth."

From a memorandum in the same page of the Register it appears that this order was copied by the Rev. Mr. Atkinson, then minister of Aldbourne.]

[x] [The title of the book here referred to is, 'The Holy Table, Name and Thing, &c., written long ago by a Minister in Lincolnshire.' It was the production of Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, whose name appears as its licenser for the press. Heylin replied to it in his 'Antidotum Lincoliense.']

of Fathers and histories of the Church, (61) which speak in general terms of all, but where they speak of particular Churches only.

So that suppose the most that can be, that is, suppose his quotations be all truly alleged, and true too in the sense that the minister takes them, (though in very truth, the places, most of them, are neither truly alleged, nor sensed,) yet they are but exceptions of, and exemptions from the general practice. And you know both in law and reason, *exceptio firmat regulam in non exceptis*[y]. So that upon the sudden I am not able to resolve, whether this minister hath done more wrong to himself or his readers, for he hath abused both.

The other is, that in the judgment of very many learned men, which have perused this book, the author (62) is clearly conceived to want a great deal of that learning, to which he pretends; or else to have written this book wholly and resolvedly against both his science and his conscience.

And for my own part, I am fully of opinion, this book was thrust now to the press, both to countenance these libellers, and, as much as in him lay, to fire both Church and State.

And though I wonder not at the minister, yet I should wonder at the bishop of the diocese (a man of learning and experience), that he should give testimony to such a business, and in such times as these.

And once more, before I leave the 'Holy Table, Name and Thing,' give me leave to put you in mind, that there is no danger at all in the altar, 'name or thing.' For at the begin(63)ning of the Reformation, though there were a law for the taking down of the altars, and setting up of holy tables in the room of them; yet in some places the altars were not suddenly removed. And what says the Queen in her Injunction to this? Why she says, 'that there seems no matter of great moment in this, saving for uniformity, and the better imitation of the law in that behalf[z].' Therefore
2 for any danger or hurt that was in the altars, 'name or thing,' they might even then have been left standing, 'but for uniformity, and the imitation of the law.'

[y] [See Gloss in Clement. lib. v. tit. xi. cap. 1. § 'Cum autem.']

[z] Injunct. ultim. [Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. p. 188.]

But howsoever, it follows in the same Injunction, 'that when the altar is taken down, the holy table shall be set in (not cross) the place where the altar stood;' which, as is aforesaid, (64) must needs be altarwise.

14. The FOURTEENTH and the last INNOVATION comes with a mighty charge, and 'tis taken out of an 'Epistle to the temporal Lords of his Majesty's Privy Council.' Of which epistle we got one sheet, and so (for aught I yet know) that impression stayed. In that sheet is this charge; the words are:

'The prelates, to justify their proceedings, have forged a new article of religion, brought from Rome (which gives them full power to alter the doctrine and discipline of our Church at a blow,' (as they interpret it,) 'and have foisted it' (such is their language) 'into the beginning of the 20th Article of our Church. And this is in the last edition of the Articles, *anno* 1628, in affront of his Majesty's Declaration before them,' &c.

(65) The clause (which they say is forged by us) is this: 'The Church' (that is, the Bishops, as they expound it) 'hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in matter of faith.' (The word is 'controversies of faith,' by their leave.) 'This clause,' say they, 'is a forgery fit to be examined, and deeply censured in the Star-Chamber. For 'tis not to be found in the Latin or English Articles of Edward VI. or Queen Elizabeth, ratified by Parliament.'

And then in the margent thus: 'If to forge a will or writing be censurable in the Star-Chamber, which is but a wrong to a private man; how much more the forgery of an article of religion, to wrong the whole Church, and overturn religion, which concerns all our souls?'

(66) This is a heavy charge, my Lords; but I thank God the answer's easy.

And truly I grant, that to forge an article of religion in whole or in part, and then to thrust it upon the Church, is a most heinous crime, far worse than the forging of a deed. And is certainly very deeply censurable in this court. And I would have humbly besought you, that a deep censure might have been laid upon it, but that this sheet was found

after, and so is not annexed to the information, nor in judgment at this present before you.

But then, my Lords, I must tell you, I hope to make it as clear as the day, that this forgery was not, that this clause mentioned was added by the prelates to the Article, to gain power to the Church, and so to serve (67) our turns; but that that clause in the beginning of the Article was by these men, or at least by some of their faction, rased out, and this to weaken the just power of the Church to serve their turns.

They say (to justify their charge) that this clause is not to be found in the Articles, English or Latin, of either Edw. VI. or Q. Elizabeth.

I answer: The Articles of Edw. VI. and those made under Q. Elizabeth differ very much. And those of Edw. VI. are not now binding. So whether the clause be in or out of them, 'tis not much material.

But for the Articles of the Church of England, made in the Queen's time, and now in force, that this clause for the power of the Church to 'decree ceremonies, and to have authority in con(68)troversies of faith,' should not be found in English or Latin copies till the year 1628, that it was set forth with the King's Declaration before it, is to me a miracle; but your Lordships shall see the falsehood and boldness of these men.

What? Is this affirmative clause in no copy, English or Latin, till the year 1628? Strange. Why, my Lords, I have a copy of the Articles in English of the year 1612, and of the year 1605, and of the year 1593, and in Latin of the year 1563, which was one of the first printed copies, if not the first of all. For the Articles were agreed on but the nine-and-twentieth day of January, *anno* 1563.[a]

And in all these, this affirmative clause for the Church's power is in. (69) And is not this strange boldness, then, to abuse the world, and falsely to say 'tis in no copy, when I myself, out of my own store, am able to show it in so many, and so anciently?

But, my Lords, I shall make it plainer yet: for 'tis not fit concerning an Article of religion, and an Article of such consequence for the order, truth, and peace of this Church,

[a] [In 1562, according to the English computation.]

you should rely upon my copies, be they never so many or never so ancient.

Therefore I sent to the public records in my office, and here under my officer's hand, who is a public notary, is returned me the twentieth Article with this affirmative clause in it[b]. And there is also the whole body of the Articles to be seen.

[b] [The Editor is indebted to the Rev. W. C. Sharpe, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, for a copy of the following paper, preserved in the library of that Society:—

"A Transcript of a Paper thus endorsed by A. B. Laud's own hand. 'Jun. 12, 1637. A Transcript out of my Registry concerning ye 20th Article of those y^t were made 1562.'

"Extract. e Registro Principali Sedis Archiep. Cant. &c.

"Acta Convocationum tempore Rev^mi D^ni Parker Archiep'i Cantuar. &c.

"In Convocatione Anno D^ni 1562 in Capellâ Regis Henrici 7^mi infra Eccl'am Collegiatam D. Petri Westmon. situat. tentâ die Martis 19° die mensis Januarii Sess. 3^tia pag. 19 & 20 prædicti libri, inter alia actum erat prout sequitur.

"Tandem dictus Rev^mus accersiri jussit ad se Prolocutorem domus inferioris, Qui quidem Prolocutor unà cum sex aliis de Clero dictæ domus infer. coram Patribus sui copiam faciens proposuit & asseruit q^d quidam de dictâ domo exhibuerunt quasdam diversas schedas de rebus Reformandis per eos respectivè excogitat. & in Scripta redact. Quæ quidem Schedæ de cõmuni consensu traditæ sunt quibusdam viris gravioribus & doctioribus de cœtu dict. domus infer. ad hoc electis perspiciendæ & considerandæ. Quibus sic electis (ut asseruit) assignatum est ut hujusmodi Schedas in Capitula redigant ac in proximâ Sessione exhibeant coram eodem Prolocutore; et ulterius proposuit q^d articuli in Synodo Londinensi tempore nuper Regis Edw. 6^ti (ut asseruit) editi, traditi sint quibusdam aliis viris ex cœtu dictæ domus infer. ad hoc etiam electis ut eos diligenter inspiciant, examinent & considerent, ac prout eis visum fuerit, corrigant & reforment ac in proximâ Sessione etiam exhibeant. Et tunc Rev^mus hujusmodi negotia per dictum Prolocutorem & Clerum incepta approbavit, ac in eisdem in prox. Sessionem juxta eorum determinationem procedere voluit & mandavit.

"Octava Sessio.

"Die Veneris 29° viz. die mensis Januarij Anno D^ni prædicto inter horas 8 et 9^am ante meridiem ejusdem diei Rev^mo in Christo Patre D^no Matthæo Archiep'o Cantuar. etc. necnon Reverendis Patribus D^nis Edmundo Londin., Rob. Winton., [Jo]han. Hereforden., Rolando Bangor, Joan. Sarum., Nicol. Lincoln., Johanne Norwicen., Richardo Meneven., Thomâ Asaphen., Edmundo Roffen., Richardo Glocestren., Thomâ Cov. et Lichfield., Gilberto Bathon. et Wellen., Richardo Elien., Wilhelmo Exon. respectivè Ep'is in domo Capitulari Eccl'æ Cathedralis D. Pauli London. congregatis, post tractatum aliquem inter eos habitum tandem super quibusdam articulis orthodoxæ fidei inter Ep'os, quorum nomina eis subscribuntur, unanim. convenit, quorum quidem articulorum tenores sequuntur in Eccl. præd. In quo tenore articulus vicesimus de Ecclesiæ authoritate sic se habet in hæc verba, p. 27.

"'Habet Eccl'a ritus statuendi jus & in fidei controversiis auctoritatem, quamvis Eccl'æ non licet quicquam instituere q^d verbo Dei scripto adversetur, nec unum Scripturæ locum sic exponere potest ut alteri contradicat; quare licet Eccl'a sit divinorum librorum testis & conservatrix, attamen ut adversus eos nihil decernere, ita præter illos nil credendum de necessitate Salutis debet obtrudere.'

"P. 31.

"Hos articulos fidei Christianæ continentes in universum novemdecim paginas in autographo q^d asservatur apud Rev^mum in Christo Patrem D^nm Matthæum Cantuar. Ep'um totius Angliæ Primatem Metrop. Archiep'i et Ep'i utriusq^e provinciæ Regni Angliæ in Sacrâ Provinciali Synodo legitimè congregati unanimi assensu recipiunt & profitentur & ut veros & orthodoxos manuum suarum subscriptionibus approbant 29° die mensis

0) By this your Lordships see how free the prelates are . forging this part of the Article. Now let these men themselves and their faction, as they can, for their *r expurgatorius* and their foul rasure in leaving out this of the Article. For to leave out of an Article is as great ime as to put in; and a main rasure is as censurable in court as a forgery.

'hy, but then, my Lords, what is this mystery of iniquity? 'uly, I cannot certainly tell; but as far as I can I 'll 'ou.

ıe Articles you see were fully and fairly agreed to and cribed in the year 1563. But after this, in the year , there were some that refused to subscribe, but why did so is not recorded. Whe(71)ther it were about Article, or any other, I know not. But in fact this is fest, that in that year 1571, the Articles were printed in Latin and English, and this clause for the Church ɔut of both[c]. And certainly, this could not be done, but he malicious cunning of that opposite faction. And gh I shall spare dead men's names where I have not inty; yet if you be pleased to look back and consider

rii An° Dni secundum compu-
em Eccl'æ Anglicanæ 1562°,
rsusqe Clerus inferioris domus
n etiam unanimiter & recepit
ofessus est, ut ex manuum
n subscriptionibus patet, quas
t & deposuit apud eundem
m 5to die Februarii anno præ-

. Convocatione tentâ An° Dni
inter alia p. 110 continetur ut
ur,
; tunc dictus Revmus dimisso
domus infer. exceptis Prolo-
ac Decanis & archidiaconis
& jussit ut omnes de cœtu
qui Articulis, de quibus in
o Londinensi An° Dni juxta
ıt. Eccl'æ Angl. 1562 inter Ar-
ɔs et Ep'os utriusque Provinciæ,
ı universum Clerum convenit,
ıus non subscripserunt modo
bscribant; & qd omnes & sin-
ui eisdem articulis subscribere
int aut recusaverint (si qui tales
antur) a dicta domo inferiori &
Cleri præd. penitus excludantur.
ı Convocatione tentâ An° Dni
Regniqe Serenissimi Dni Jacobi
Anno 2do Revdo Patre Dno Ri-
chardo London. Ep'o tunc Præsidente.
"Sess. 16.
"Demum idem Revdus Præses London. Ep'us protulit quendam librum articulorum de quibus in Synodo London. communi assensu Archiep'orum, Ep'orum & Cleri utriusque Provinciæ consensum est Anno Dni 1562 ad tollendam opinionum varietatem & confirmand. veram, uniformem Christi religionem Regiâ authoritate & assensu publicatis et in Anno Dni 1571 per &c. revisis. Quem per Mag. Wil. Wood Legum Doctorem alta & intelligibili voce perlegi fecit, quo lecto dicti Revdi Patres consensum et assensum suos eisdem articulis præstiterunt & eorum nomina manibus suis propriis eisdem articulis respectivè subscripserunt tunc et ibidem.
"Concordat cum Reg'ro præd. factâ collatione per me Sac. Wade Notum Publicum."]

[c] [Strype (Life of Parker, book iv. chap. v.) states that he had seen three different English editions of the Articles, printed in 1571 by Jugg and Cawood, in all of which this clause was found.]

who they were that governed businesses in 1571, and rid the Church almost at their pleasure; and how potent the ancestors of these libellers began then to grow, you will think it no hard matter to have the Articles printed, and this clause left out.

And yet 'tis plain, that, after (72) the stir about subscription in the year 1571, the Articles were settled and subscribed unto at last, as in the year 1562, with this clause in them for the Church: for looking further into the records which are in mine own hands, I have found the book of 1563 subscribed by all the Lower House of Convocation, in this very year of contradiction, 1571, Dr. John Elmar (who was after Lord Bishop of London) being there Prolocutor: Alexander Nowel, Dean of St. Paul's, having been Prolocutor in 1563, and yet living and present and subscribing in 1571[d]. Therefore, I do here openly in the Star-Chamber charge upon that pure sect this foul corruption of falsifying the Articles of the Church of England; let them take it off as they can.

(73) I have now done, and 'tis time I should, with the innovations charged upon the prelates, and fit to be answered here.

Some few more there are, but they belong to matter of 84 doctrine, which shall presently be answered, *justo volumine*, at large, to satisfy all well-minded people[e]. But when Mr. Burton's book, which is the main one, is answered, (I mean his book, not his railing,) neither Prynn, nor Bastwick, nor any attendants upon Rabshakeh, shall by me or my care be answered. If this court find not a way to stop these libellers' mouths and pens, for me they shall rail on till they be weary.

Yet one thing more, I beseech you, give me leave to add. 'Tis Master Burton's charge upon the (74) prelates. 'That the censures formerly laid upon malefactors, are now put upon God's ministers for their virtue and piety[f].'

A heavy charge this too. But if he or any man else can show that any man hath been punished in the High-Com-

[d] [This very copy is preserved among Selden's books in the Bodleian Library.]

[e] [It was answered by Peter Heylin, in a book entitled, 'A Brief and Moderate Answer to the Seditious and Scandalous Challenges of Henry Burton,' &c. Lond. 1637.]

[f] Page 175.

mission, or elsewhere, by the prelates, for virtue and piety, there is all the reason in the world we should be severely punished ourselves. But the truth is, the virtue and piety for which these ministers are punished, is for preaching schism and sedition, many of their sermons being as bad as their libels, as Burton's libel was one of his sermons first. But whether this stuff have any affinity with virtue and piety, I submit to any Christian reader.

(75) And yet Mr. Burton is so confident of his innocency, even in this cause wherein he hath so foully carried himself, that he breaks forth into these words: 'I never so much as once dreamed, that impiety and impudency itself, in such a Christian State as this is, and under such a gracious Prince, durst ever thus publicly have called me in question, and that upon the open stage,' &c.[g]

You see the boldness of the man, and in as bad a cause as, I think, in this kind ever any man had.

I shall end all with a passage out of S. Cyprian[h], when he, then Bishop of Carthage, was bitterly railed upon by a pack of schismatics, his answer was, and 'tis now mine: 'They have railed both bitterly and falsely upon (76) me, and yet *non oportet me paria cum illis facere,* it becomes not me to answer them with the like either levities or revilings, but to speak and write that only which becomes *sacerdotem Dei,* a priest of God.'

Neither shall I in this give way (though I have been extremely vilified) to either grief or passion to speak, remembering that of the Psalmist, Psal. xxxvii. 8, 'Fret not thyself, else shalt thou be moved to do evil.'

Neither yet, by God's grace, shall the reproaches of such men as these make me faint, or start aside, either from the right way in matter of practice, (they are S. Cyprian's words again[i],) or *a certa regula,* 'from the certain rule of faith.'

And since, in former times, some spared not to call the Master of the (77) house Beelzebub, how much more will they be bold with them of his household? as it is in St. Mat-

[g] [Burton's Appeal,] page 7.

[h] [S. Cypr.] Lib. i. Ep. 3. [Ep. lv. ad Cornel. p. 85. Ed. Ben.]

[i] ["Nec movere nos debent convicia perditorum, quominus a via recta et a certa regula non recedamus."] —Ib. p. 10. [Ibid. p. 83.]

thew x. 25. And so bold have these men been; but the next words of our Saviour are, 'Fear them not.'

I humbly crave pardon of your Lordships for this my necessary length, and give you all hearty thanks for your noble patience, and your just and honourable censure upon these men, and your unanimous dislike of them, and defence of the Church.

But because the business hath some reflection upon myself, I shall forbear to censure them, and leave them to God's mercy and the King's justice[k].

[k] [The sentence of the court was, that they should each be fined 5000*l.*, be deprived of their ears, and be committed to prison. The sentence was accordingly executed; after which, Bastwick was committed to Launceston, Burton to Lancaster, and Prynne to Caernarvon Castle. Afterwards they were respectively removed to S. Mary's Castle, in Scilly Island, to Cornet Castle, in Guernsey, and Mont Orgueil, in Jersey. Their conduct when in the pillory is described in the Biographia Britannica, in the notes to their several lives, and in a letter from Garrard to Wentworth (Strafford Letters, vol. ii. p. 85). They were released from prison in 1640, and entered London in triumph.]

*** [It is stated in the Harleian Cat. (vol. ii. p. 669.) that there were only twenty-five copies of the first edition of this Speech; which seems hardly probable, considering that there are three copies still preserved in the Bodleian Library alone. (Wood, Ath. iii. 135.) It has not been thought necessary to cumber these pages with extracts from Bp. Williams's notes on the Speech, which are there mentioned. It was translated into French in 1637, of which translation there is a copy in the Cathedral Library, Canterbury.

SPEECH

AT THE

TRIAL OF JOHN WILLIAMS,

BISHOP OF LINCOLN,

JULY 19, 1637.

[Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. pp. 438–445[a].]

SORRY I am, my Lords, that such a man as my Lord Bishop of Lincoln for profession, and sorry that he, being so wise, so discreet and understanding a man every way, should come to stand culpable of such faults as should deserve the censure of this court, and in this nature, that it should fall out, that by being over-active and over-doing businesses of other men's, to undo his own, nay even hereby also to undo himself.

We have adversaries too many amongst ourselves, but this day's work opens a way for the Romanists to take advantage by it, to see so eminent a person as a Bishop, and so eminent a Bishop as he, to become thus censurable in a thing of so high a nature in this high court; it opens a way, I say, to them of rejoicing, which I would to God had not been at all, or at least not by him.

When I look upon and consider his excellent parts, both of nature and achieved unto by study and art; when I think upon his wisdom, learning, agility of memory, and the experience that accompanies him with all those endowments, it puts me to a stand; that after he had been overtaken in one error in the first cause[b], he should not have recalled himself, and made a stand, but that he hath now run on into a far

[a] [There are two copies of this speech in the Ashmolean MSS., Numb. 800, Art. vi., Numb. 824, Art. vii. The first of these is a brief abstract; the other a full report, apparently taken down at the time. That in Rushworth seems to have been printed from a similar report. Several places that were clearly wrong in Rushworth have been corrected, and passages supplied, from the Ashmole MS.]

[b] [The first charge brought against Williams was for revealing the King's secrets, contrary to his oath as a Privy Counsellor.]

worse, and more desperate a one in this cause, by obnoxious and criminal ways, even to a very precipitation and downfall of himself and his credit.

What though there was some question made, and some proofs on foot, whereby his loyalty to the King his master seemed to be in dispute, and his discretion might have someways come to a trial in matter of words, discovering his affection in some matters of state, must he seek unlawful means to procure his actions and words to be lawful, and leave the course of a good conscience, to bolster up a fancy of innocency in another man, and make himself plainly faulty, for to make another man seem free from shame[c]? I could wish heartily from my heart, (however this cause be, let it be as it is,) that his deportment for passion had been like to that of St. Cecilia. I read it in a very good author, and it is not impertinent, nor unworthy, what her patience was. When a great stir there was, and all the stream and current ran quite against her, to bear her down in a most furious and violent manner, she mildly in the heat of these storms, and when those billows seemed to overwhelm her, and hide her from all hopes of being admitted hearing her to plead her own innocency, much less to gain success to her desires, it being told her there were many witnesses against her, but none that did, or would be seen to appear for her, or in her behalf; she used the saying of holy Job, *Testis meus est in cœlis*, 'My witness is above[d];' and so it fell out, for (as the story saith) when the matter came to be scanned, the witnesses that were against her, (by what means, or from whence, or how, I know not,) but they were so daunted and struck with such an amazement, that it was their general vote, *Nos nihil habemus contra Ceciliam.* I have it in St. Augustine, a Father of the Church, (whose authority there is no doubt of, he being held learned among the best of that time,) *lib.* i. *contra Hæreticum Donatum*[e]. It had been better with my Lord Bishop, if he had had such a cause. I am sure, in the circumstances, if his behaviour had been more temperate, and mixed with more patience, the

[c] [Prigeon, the principal witness in Williams's favour, was charged with incontinency, and Williams was accused of tampering with the witnesses who supported this charge.]

[d] [Job xvi. 19.]

[e] [There appears to be a serious error in this reference, which the Editor cannot correct.]

event could not have been so unlucky, and his censure so sharp, as it is now like to be.

I may be bold to say it, my Lords, (it 's no untruth,) I have been five several times upon my knees to the King my master in his behalf, I delivered for him several petitions myself into the King's own hand, and I then did that (which had I known what now I do) I should not have done. I sent him, under my own hand, the King's answer upon every petition. And after all those five several services, I must tell you, my Lords, I was but coarsely dealt withal, nay very ill requited; yet was I overcome to move again, and I have it under his own hand, or (if his secretary writ the letter) his own hand and name is underscribed, that he had better and more hopes by my once moving the King, than he had formerly had, by the solicitation and means of all the friends he had at court.

And no longer ago than at Christmas last I moved the King my master again in his behalf[f]; and then (had he followed that which was intended for his good, and prosecuted the same with submission) it had in all likelihood gone better with him than he could have expected, nay, I think, as the case stood, better than he then desired.

But a cross business came just in the way at the very time (of which your Lordships, or the most part of you, I am sure, are privy to), and had not I then interposed myself (the King being then so exasperated against him), he had fallen. But to let pass my desires, and the earnestness I used, and the tenderness I had, lest my public aspersion should have been opened, and such as could not have been wiped away, but needs have left a stain to my coat, I must needs say thus much for his Majesty, he was very inclinable to have had a fair reconcilement, as may appear by his often asking, 'What Lincoln did? Doth he seek to repair my credit? Hath he any show of sorrowfulness for his fault?' And, my Lords, I may safely say (because I truly speak it), whoever penned his petitions (howsoever they seemed to be his friends, or whoever advised him to let them pass in that form), they did him (though questionless he is able to pen them himself) an injury; yet if he did it by

[f] [See Laud's Letter to Williams, Jan. 6, 1636.]

advice, they were not therein his friends; for in them all there was not at any time one word tending to submission or confession, or so much as an acknowledgment of a fault, whereby any show of reparation in that nature might be made to his Majesty, as both in duty he ought, and in wisdom might have made proffer of, and with more safety and assurance have performed; insomuch as that, by his stiff and stubborn behaviour, there was no way but to have the business fully ripped up, heard, and decided. Yet there were not wanting divers ill-disposed persons, who bruited it forth, and very boldly gave out, that my Lord Bishop of Lincoln had not made any fault, or done, or spoken aught, but that which he could stand unto, and needed not to be ashamed of; only that he was rich, and must be let blood, he might well spare it, and the King wanted 10,000*l.* or 12,000*l.*, and so he should have little said to him, if it was once condescended unto, and either given by him, or gotten from him. But howsoever these reports go, the King is just, as he is honourable; and though he was inclined to mercy (for so the Bishop of Lincoln had found it, if he had sought it seasonably), yet now you see there is cause, and just cause of censure, and in a very high nature of desert in him to be sentenced by this court.

Now for the nature of the cause, the several charges and the proofs, the defences also that have been made by my Lord Bishop's Counsel, all hath fully and amply been opened by the two Lords Chief Justices[g], and if I should attempt anything this way, it were but needless labour to myself, and would breed a tedious troublesomeness to your Lordships; *dictum dicere* would be all, when I had said all.

I leave to meddle with the manner of the proceedings, and must give Mr. Attorney[h] a great and large commendation, and Mr. Solicitor[i] also, for their wise stating of the cause, and for their wisdom, wit, temper, and patience in the prosecuting of the same.

The matter is ill, and howsoever it perhaps be not subornation of perjury, yet to tamper with witnesses, to threaten, deter, affright, corrupt, silence, or absent those that are to witness the truth, and to give evidence in a court of justice, are *ejusdem naturæ*, a very foul crime, and a most odious and

[g] [Finch and Bramston.] [h] [Sir John Banks.] [i] [Sir Edward Littleton.]

detestable fault in any man, of what condition soever he be; and if these things be suffered, and may go unpunishable, no state can stand; it destroys the interest of *meum* and *tuum*, and no man is sure of what he holds, or can say whether he hath an estate or no.

It 's a point that ruins all right, and is the utter enemy and subverter of all justice, and must needs overthrow any state, where it is not weeded out, and prevented by severe animadversion, and correction, where it happens to be found out.

First, it destroys *maximum mandatum*, the great commandment given by the great Lawgiver, God himself, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness.' In the fifth of Leviticus [k], if a man know a truth he is not to conceal it, nay, he is to witness it.

In the twenty-third of Exodus [l], a man is not in any case to bear unjust witness; and so in the nineteenth of Deuteronomy [m] it is *in criminalibus*, and he that did bear false witness was to suffer *per legem talionis* that same punishment and loss, which by his false testimony the other party should have undergone.

In all the time that passes from the creation of the world until the Law, I do not find that the Holy Ghost once made mention of any that attempted in this way. I find no shadow nor overture of any such crime. The corruption of nature had not then grown to the height, and so overswollen the banks, as to break out so outrageously, and produce any such ill-disposed persons.

Insomuch as I find not any track, no *vestigium* of the like precedent for above 3000 years: and the Fathers of the Church upon that place, where it is said, 'Out of the mouth of two or three witnesses shall everything be justified [n];' they descant upon it, why two or three witnesses in matters of consequence? Because, say they, if so many, they should not be subject to be tampered withal, being they might be of several tempers, several conditions, and so the truth might be had by some of them, if not by all.

And for a long time I read of none, but of the devilish practice and leading piece of impiety set on foot by Jesabel, for what cause, and how prosecuted, you know as well as myself, and what she was, how she sped, and what end she made, is

[k] [Levit. v. 1.]
[l] [Exod. xxiii. 1.]
[m] [Deut. xix. 19.]
[n] [Ibid. 15.]

recorded to posterity. Yet, my Lords, I pray you observe, and note with me, how warily the Holy Ghost goeth about in the setting forth of this fact, and the passages therein, in the 21st verse; as if the Spirit of God was unwilling to display and discover the heinousness of this monster hatched by this vile woman; as if He would not have it seen, He shadows it forth in a low strain, that there came in two sons of Belial, and said, &c. 1 Kings, cap. xxi. As if the original of this odious practice was not rooted in human nature, but took his birth from hell; it came in with two sons of Belial in the devil's name.

Well, afterwards such a tutor could not want apt scholars, and, as St. Paul saith in another place, when I come to speak of it 'after the manner of men,' I find it then practised, and that (with a witness) 'it outfaced the God of truth,' though truth itself must not be trodden under foot; but this engine fetched from hell must be planted to defeat the counsels of God Almighty. They found out and hired false witness against Christ Himself. Who they were you know; 'The chief priests and the elders, and all the whole council, sought false witness against Jesus to put Him to death[o].' And after Him, Stephen had the same measure; 'Then they suborned men, who said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God[p].'

Thus amongst those stiff-necked and hard-hearted Jews, the fault was in use, when sin and iniquity grew ripe, and as the prophet saith, 'faith and truth could scarce be found amongst mortal men[q];' but the subversion and destruction of their city follows, and there comes in the government of a warlike nation and people, the Romans; amongst whom I find some laws made against false witnesses, and those very severe ones.

Besides other laws, in the law of the Twelve Tables there is a strict law confirmed against it; and these Twelve Tables were not made by any mean advice or persons, but by the persons of a powerful Consul and the *decemviri;* that he that was found faulty in this notorious crime, he was to be thrown down a steep high rock, to have his bones shivered all to pieces, *e monte Tarpeio,* or *e saxo Tarpeio*[r]; afterwards

[o] [Mark xiv. 55.]
[p] [Acts vi. 11.]
[q] [Jer. v. 1.]
[r] [Legg. XII. Tabularum, Tab. VII. leg. xii.]

the lawgivers pursued this fault with banishment and confiscation of goods; *Confiscatio bonorum fiat, et puniatur uti pro crimine falsi,* which in those times was a heavy and most severe punishment, whereby their posterity also was branded with the fault of them that went before them.

In the ninety-fifth Counsel I find a course set down for the prevention of this crime, and a punishment set for the offenders therein [s].

And in later times Bartolus [t] often meets with it, and goes very precisely and very exactly in the case, that if so be it be found in any man, so much as an overture of tampering with witnesses, it is censurable; *reus est,* he is guilty, though he effect not his purpose, if he menace, threaten, or deter a witness. And so, my Lords, shall I do,—hold him fit for censure. I hold him worthy of censure, though he but barely attempt to smother, deter, or hinder any witness, when he is to give his testimony; be it by words, looks, or actions, promises or threats, it comes much to one in my opinion upon the matter.

Now, my Lords, to come unto the laws of the Church, if we peruse the canon and ecclesiastical law, there we shall often in every age have somewhat or other still established against it. In the canon law, the second part of the Decretals, 22. Caus., if any man shall be a suborner of witnesses, *etiamsi instigâtus aut compulsus a domino* [u], if he bring a false testimony, though he be even enforced to it by his superior, his lord, governor, or his master, deliver him over to excommunication, *et sic maneat usque ad exitum vitæ,* and so he must stand and remain in that state and case during term of life. A grievous thing, and a most heavy burden, inflicted on the offender, though nowadays and in our times excommunications are slighted, and little set by; yet in cases of this nature, when the offence is so high and transcendent, and of condition tending to the ruin and condemnation of the soul, the party at that time, and for that present, even dallying, mocking, and abusing of God to His very face, to be left void

[s] [The Editor has examined several collections of 'Consilia,' but cannot find the passage referred to.]

[t] [Vid. Bartolum (de Saxoferrato) De Reprobatione Testium, apud Tractatus Univ. Juris, tom. iv. p. 72, seq.]

[u] [Vid. Decret. par. ii. Caus. xxii. Quæst. v. cap. i. 'Qui compulsus.' Corp. Jur. Can. tom. i. col. 1274. The words which follow 'et... exitum vitæ,' are found in substance in cap. vii. ibid. col. 1275.]

of the communion of saints, to be bereaved of the benefit of being a member of Christ's flock, and cut off from that holy body the Church, I think that no man is in a worse and a more miserable estate; and more to be pitied, if he be insensible of it himself.

To come to the first Council of Macedon [Macon], the seventeenth canon, *Si scit illum falso juraturum, reus esto.* And what is he guilty of? Of no small matter. Ranked and ranged in the degree and place of a murderer—*et cum homicidis*[x].

Nay, he is worse than a manslayer, for he that kills a man destroys but one, and that but the body neither, for he cannot any way infringe the union of his soul, that it had with its Maker. But he that goes about to suborn and procure false witnesses, he at one time destroys two souls, both his own, and the soul of him that he so in that kind intermeddles withal; and unless he be rejoined again by the renewing of faith, and serious and hearty repentance, he sets God and both their souls at odds.

Afterwards you find it in the western parts of England; and in France, in the seventeenth [canon of the] Council of Agatha, you have a tamperer with witnesses adjudged to death[y]; even in the time of Alaricus, who was no better than a barbarous Goth, this crime was disallowed, made horrid and abominable, and held severely to be punished.

You may find it in St. Augustine, who lived about some 400 years after our Saviour Christ, and indeed he most excellently sets it out, in his 28th Sermon, *De Nativitate Domini*[z]; either he had it out of that Council, or the Council out of him, being much-what both at one time, and in one age.

Some parts of Greece, I find, did affect and patronise lying, but Tully wittily girds them for it, saying they were not wise to countenance folly[b]; yet I find that Aristotle, in his Rheto-

[x] [The Council of Macon contains no statement of the kind. See Decret. par. ii. Caus. xxii. Quæst. v. cap. vii. It seems to be a reference to the following passage of S. Aug. quoted in the same Quæst. cap. v.: "Ille autem qui hominem provocavit ad jurationem et scit eum falsum esse juraturum, vincit homicidam. Quia homicida corpus occisurus est, ille animam; imo duas, et ejus quem jurare provocavit, et suam."—S. Aug. Serm. cccviii. cap. 4. Op., tom. v. col. 1836. A.]

[y] [The seventeenth canon of the Council of Agde states nothing of the kind. The statement that parricides and perjurers are to be condemned to death is found, Decret. par. ii. Caus. xxiii. Quæst. v. cap. xl. 'Rex debet.'—Corp. Jur. Can. tom. i. col. 1350.]

[z] [S. Aug. Serm. clxxx. (al. De Verbis Apost. xxviii.) Op., tom. v. col. 1248.]

[a] [See Orat. pro L. Flacco, cap. iv.]

rics, concerning the interrogatories to witnesses, gives admirable rules, and such as, though short, comprehends the most-what of the most settled, and the wittiest, and the safest ways used now-a-days in that kind; lib. ii. Rhet. you may read the ways of prevention herein by him set down.

And to come into our own country, about the year 1222, in the reign of King Henry III., and if I do name Henry III. your Lordships know that it was a troublesome time, yet I read that Stephen Langton, my predecessor, (then Archbishop of Canterbury,) called a Council to be held at Oxford: the main business was for the reformation of two points; the one was concerning marriage, the other concerning exhereditation, &c.; where I find a foul penance inflicted and set out for him that shall either bear false witness by himself, or procure it in another [b].

For he that is a tamperer this way, he is guilty of no small crime, doing (at one and the same time) wrong to three of the greatest persons in the world, namely, 1, to God; 2, to the King; 3, to the innocent, who, *in conspectu Dei*, in the sight of God, is a person of no small esteem.

First, he manifestly wrongs God by a notorious contempt, by a very slighting and vilifying His omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotency.

He disrobes God of that which is His very essence, for God is truth. And he that dares thus outface God's truth, and wittingly deviseth and practiseth to lay it aside, and keep it from the light; I find him in very nature to be abhorred, and held unfit for human society. Aristotle himself, in that glimmering he had of divine learning, deciphers such a one, and sets him out by these very characters; he must be one *qui pietatem non curat* [c], a man that matters not at all for piety; he must either deny the Deity, or else think he can escape the reach of the celestial powers, such a one *qui putat se latere Deo*, he must be able to skulk on the one side, and absent himself from the hand of God at his pleasure.

Secondly, in the next place, another great person unto whom he doth injury, is the King, whom he plainly cheateth to his face, and wrongeth him in the very seat of justice, even forcing his officers, the grave and learned judges, will they, nill they, to do injustice; for if the witnesses be suborned,

[b] [Wilkins' Conc. tom. i. p. 585.] [c] [Arist. Rhet. ad Alexand. cap. xviii.]

and give in false evidence, the juror cannot come near the truth, and the judge must needs exact, order, and sentence, what otherwise they neither would, nor ought to have done.

Last of all, the third person that is wronged, *in conspectu Dei* is a person of no small esteem, the innocent (one little enough, God He knows, of no esteem, or of very little many times in the eye of the world, yet is he gracious and great too in the sight of God); and he is also most shamefully wronged and abused, nay, perhaps undone, by the indirect practices of those false witnesses. Sometimes his person is traduced, his fame and credit either stained, or else quite taken away, or so shaken, that it's a shrewd matter to deal with him; another while his estate, his birthright, is wrested from him, or else withdrawn, and for a time withheld from him; one while his goods, another while his lands, a third time himself is at stake; so life, lands, goods, and all are in danger: well, though such witnesses be against him, his plea is never a whit the worse *in foro cœli*, his inheritance is laid up amongst the saints, *testimonium ejus est in cœlis* [d]: 'Doubtless there is a reward for the righteous, verily there is a God that judgeth the earth [e]:' 'for there is nothing hid which shall not be revealed [f].'

And thus, my Lords, have I said what I thought fit, though not so much as the crime deserves, for my time being scanted, I have laid it out, though roughly, yet so as it may easily be seen of what a vile nature this cankered and pestilent weed is, and from whence it had its original, and how odious and detestable it hath been to all ages, how dangerous the effects be that proceed from it, and therefore how carefully it ought to be looked unto, and suppressed in all good commonwealths.

I shall make my word good in my brevity concerning the last thing I am to perform, and shall pass over the sentence very speedily: to make any repetitions were but *actum agere* (as my Lord of London said), therefore I will be very short in this.

I find much tampering and striving by my Lord Bishop's agents for to suppress and decline a truth.

I wonder that Lake should be sent to the University of Cambridge presently to take the degree of Doctor, and that they would let him pass.

[d] [Job xvi. 19.] [e] [Psal. lviii. 10.] [f] [Matth. x. 26.]

I cannot commend Mosteyn (though otherwise a very civil and deserving man, and I think very true and trusty to his master); yet to be present when a blank is to be put up, and an affidavit to be made to a blank by his privity, and in his presence, this is not honest; he might have done well to have disallowed the proceedings, or at least not been present, and have countenanced the same. And Walter Walker, though he be a solicitor, and must and ought to follow the causes he undertakes, with as much skill, industry, and advice as he may, yet he might have been ashamed of this blank affidavit, and he ought indeed to have suppressed it. And Mosteyn must bring him in at the back door, an unworthy part; if the business be such, as will redound to the shame of my Master, he should have come in at no door, by my being usher unto him: and if the business and bringer be justifiable, the fore-door had better fitted.

If Walker had been a good servant, it had gone better with the Bishop than now it is like to do; and if Walker do escape sentence, it's more by hap than skill, more by luck than honesty. I find him to be a very arrant honest man in all the business, and my Lord Bishop is a very miserable man, thus to defend Prigeon's good name with the loss of his own.

Catlin, he must have a living given him, and well he deserved it, but as yet he had not played his part to the full, and therefore stay your hand, my Lord, (saith Walker,) till the business be done. A manifest plain proof that there was some use to be made of this cunning and crafty fellow, to countenance the business in hand. And I can say no less than that I find Catlin to be a very lewd man, a very incendiary, and truly to be paralleled with that Catlin of Rome, against whom so many learned and eloquent Orations were writ by Cicero, that famous orator.

For Lunn, let him go on in God's name, to be put off from the place and offices that he hath; and for Powell, I could go deeper than any before me hath yet done, who prosecutes an unjust act so long, so oft, and never repents of it.

For Kilvert's affronting of my Lord Bishop in that manner he did, I must set that, and the Bishop's offering to be present at the examination of the witnesses, both in one distance, and they may very well the one of them quit the other. For if Kilvert, being upon so weighty a business, and

concerning so great a matter, interessed into it by no worse than the King's Majesty, and in a cause that concerned himself; if Kilvert, I say, should have gone puningly, faintly, and cowardly have put his finger in a hole, if he had upon my Lord's presence, and by the terms he used, gone sheepishly on in his business, the matter might have failed. Some of your Lordships have condemned him for his bold carriage toward a bishop in his own diocese; but I cannot, for my Lord and his passions were more to be condemned. A temper would better have befitted him, and indeed he ought not to have given any such occasion, and therefore it may be said, *Etiamsi ego dignus sum hac contumelia, indignus tamen, qui fecerit* [g], I pass that by as to be excused, by reason of the weightiness of the matter.

For the gaining of papers from the Council-table, I find my Lord Bishop had them long enough in his custody, and they were returned unsealed; and I do find that he proceeds to counter-proofs directly, according as he was informed by these papers, which in my mind shows apparently, that he both had them and perused them.

For Sir John Mounson, the King is wounded through his sides. I have known him a long time, and I never knew nor heard anything of him but good, and therefore do hold one thousand marks little enough for reparation of his credit, who did nothing but that which was his duty, and belonged to his place.

For my Lord Bishop of Lincoln, truly I am heartily sorry to do that which I must do, both by reason he is of my own coat, and also by reason of the place he hath in former time sustained in this court amongst your Lordships, and in this commonwealth; but I must not forbear to do that which my conscience leads me unto, and less I must not do, than for to discharge that as I ought to do.

Wherefore I shall agree with my Lord Cottington, and the rest that have gone before me, in the fine of 10,000*l.* to his Majesty, and likewise for his imprisonment in the Tower during the King's pleasure, as also to be suspended from the exercise of his ecclesiastical function, *tam a beneficiis, quam officiis*, and to be referred over to be proceeded against in the High-Commission Court, as the merit of his offence shall deserve.

[g] [Terent. Eun. v. 2. 27.]

THE ANSWER

OF

THE MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

WILLIAM,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,

TO THE

SPEECH OF THE LORD SAY AND SEAL,

TOUCHING THE LITURGY*.

THE speech begins thus:

My Lords, I have waited to find you free from greater businesses, that I might crave leave to speak of something that concerns myself. And this I have the more desired, since my Lord of Canterbury's last speech, who expressing his troubles, and bewailing the misery of his condition, and of the condition of the Church of England, (for he would needs join them together, which I think he may, as the cause and the effect, for the miseries of the Church have certainly risen from him,) he insisted much upon this: that these troubles had befallen him through the malice of two parties, the Papists and the Sectaries, and by those he said the Church was greatly afflicted.

My Lords, and all Christian readers, those great businesses which my Lord speaks of are now ended; and I hope as you are free from business, so you will be free from prejudice, while I also crave leave to speak something concerning myself. And this I also have the more desired, since I saw this honourable Lord had put his speech in print, which I find as

* [This Answer is reprinted from the first volume of Laud's Works (Lond. 1695), where it was inserted by H. Wharton, at the end of the Archbishop's History of his Troubles and Trial. The pages of this volume are noted in the margin.]

much, if not more, against me than for himself. This speech was not put in print till near six months after it was spoken; and, I conceive, was printed then to renew the business, and to whet the malice of those Sectaries against me. 'Tis true that after I was impeached by the House of Commons for high treason, there came no articles up against me in full ten 471
weeks after; then they came up in generals only; and I was called to the House to hear them on Friday, February the 26th, 164$\frac{0}{1}$. Now, by these articles I found that there was great but (I humbly praise God for it) causeless jealousy of me in point of religion. This made me labour more to clear myself from that, than from anything else objected against me, as ever hating to seem other in religion than what I truly and really am. For of all simulations or dissimulations, that is the basest, when a man, for poor, temporary, fading ends, shall shift his religion or his judgment concerning it, with the time if not with the tide, as if at all times he had somewhat to seek before he would express: whereas it is most true which St. Hilary speaks in matter of religion, *Non opus est intervallo aliquo inter cor et os*[b]: 'There's no need of a distance between the heart and the mouth; as if a man were to bethink himself of some faithless ambiguity, before he would speak that which belonged to the profession of his faith.'

Now, if seeing myself under so great a pressure, and the Church of England so hard laid at, as then it was, I did bewail the condition of both, I think I did what became me; and I hope I offended no man in 'joining our conditions together.' And whereas this honourable Lord thinks, 'that I might well join them, as the cause and the effect,' I think so too myself, but in another sense.

For his Lordship says too peremptorily, that 'the miseries of the Church have certainly risen from me.' No, certainly; the miseries of this Church have proceeded from the Separatists, and from such as for private at least, if not for worse ends, have countenanced them and their strange proceedings against the government and governors of the Church: and this so long, till they brought the Church's condition (which

[b] ["Non tardo opus est petitoque longe verbo confessionis, nec intervallo aliquo inter cor atque os relicto, ut quod ad protestationem religionis loquendum sit, per infidelem ambiguitatem cogitetur."]—St. Hilary, l. x. de Trin. p. 165. [§ 70, col. 1080. B. Paris. 1693.]

flourished before) to be the cause of my condition, such as it now is; and I fell into this condition by labouring, by all good means, to uphold the Church of England from that misery into which, I fear, it is now falling.

And I doubt not but God will open the eyes of all good men, to see clearly in time, that this was the cause which laid both me and this Church so low, and not any actions, much less practices of mine. This being so, if 'I insisted much upon this, that these troubles have befallen me through the malice of two parties, the Papists and the Sectaries' (as this honourable Lord says I did), I had great reason so to do. For, certainly, the Church of England is 'greatly afflicted' by them; and I pray God, in the end it be not torn in pieces between them. That which I then said, in my sudden speech to the Lords to this particular, was as follows[c]:—

"I am very unfortunate in this business, between the malignity of two parties against me, the Papist and the Separatist. And shall I suffer on both sides at once? Shall I be accounted a deadly enemy to the Papist, as I am reputed by them both at home and abroad; and, in the meantime, accused for no less than treason for favouring and complying with them? Well, if I do suffer, 'tis but because truth usually lies between two sides, and is beaten on both sides (as the poor Church of England is at this day by these factions). But in this and all things else, and in despite of malice, truth shall either be my protection from suffering, or my comfort while I suffer: and by God's gracious assistance I shall never depart from it, but continue at the Apostle's ward, *Nihil possum contra veritatem*: 'I can do nothing against the truth[d];' and for it, I hope, God will enable me patiently to suffer anything."

This, or to this effect, I then spake, and I hope without any offence; sure I am, without reflecting upon any particular person. Yet my Lord seems to think otherwise; for he says—

How far this man will extend this word Sectary, and whom he will comprehend under it, I know not; but I have some cause to fear that I may lie under some misapprehension

[c] [This part of the Archbishop's speech is recorded by him in the History of his Troubles and Trial, chap. vii. Works, vol. iii. p. 415.]

[d] 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

in respect of matters of this nature, which how far it concerns him, your Lordships will perceive by what I shall say.

My Lord, it seems, knows not how far I will extend the word Sectary. Truly, no further than the Church of Christ extends, it ever since sects and schisms broke in upon it, to [illegible] of peace and unity. And a Sectary is he[e] . .

. . . .

The next thing which my Lord knows not is, 'whom I will comprehend under that name;' and that his Lordship may easily know. For I comprehend none under it but such as divide from the Church, and either make or follow a breach, where no just cause is given by the Church, or where, though cause were given, ways of division are preferred before ways of peace. But that which troubles my Lord about these things, which he professes he knows not, is, that he hath some cause to fear, for so he confesses, 'that he may lie under some misapprehensions in respect of matters of this nature.' And this I think may trouble him indeed: for there's cause enough why he should fear that he may lie under, not misapprehensions, but very just apprehensions, in respect of matters of this nature, since 'tis manifest that he separates himself, as Sectaries use to do, from the common prayers of the Church; and those such as were composed by such bishops and other divines as suffered, some of them to martyrdom, for the truth of Christ; and those such also as were a second time, under the prosperous reign of Queen Elizabeth, confirmed by Act of Parliament. So that his Lordship, separating himself from those prayers which were made by the one and confirmed by the other, must needs be apprehended as a Sectary, whether you look upon Church or State. But my Lord tells you, 'that you will perceive by that which he shall say, how far this concerns me.' And therefore I pray you observe it diligently; for I cannot yet conceive how anything else that belongs to a Sectary can concern me, or anything else, much, which his Lordship can say against me.

My Lord of Canterbury! a man of mean birth, bred up in a College, (and that too frequently falls out to be in a

[e] The definition or description of a Sectary is wanting in the original.—H. W.

faction,) whose narrow comprehension extended itself no further than to carry on a side in a College, or canvass for a Proctor's place in the University.

This concerns me indeed, and very nearly; for I see his Lordship resolves to rake me up from my very birth, a way unusual for men well-bred, and little beseeming a person of honour, especially thus to insult upon a fallen fortune. But yet it concerns me not in any relation to a Sectary, unless his Lordship would possess the world that I was bred in faction, and so like enough to prove one. But how my Lord is mistaken in this will plainly appear. First, then, 'tis true I am a man of ordinary, but very honest birth; and the memory of my parents savours very well to this day, in the town in Reading, where I was born. Nor was I so meanly born as perhaps my Lord would insinuate; for my father had borne all offices in the town, save the mayoralty; and my immediate predecessor (whom I am sure my Lord himself accounted very worthy of his place) was as meanly born as myself, his father being of the same trade in Guilford that mine was of in Reading. But all this of my birth might well have been spared; for my Lord knows well enough—

'Miserum est aliorum incumbere famæ;
Ne collapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis[f];'

and that which follows in the satirist. And had my birth been meaner than it was, that would not have impaired me among men of understanding. And howsoever, this advantage I have; I have done honour to my birth, which every man hath not done, that hath had an honourable descent. To my birth, his Lordship adds that I was bred up in a College. That's true. But 'tis as true that his Lordship was bred up in a College also[g], and of the same University; and therefore, so far he speaks as much against himself as me. But I hope he intends not to charge being bred in a College, as a fault upon either of us; and though 'it too frequently falls out that Colleges be in a faction,' (for that also is too truly observed by his Lordship,) yet that is no fault in any man who neither causes nor nourishes the faction. But that which his Lordship charges next upon me is both a

[f] Juven. Satir. viii. [76, 77.]

[g] [In New College.]

weakness and a fault, if true: weakness, that 'my comprehensions are narrow;' and a fault, because 'they extended no further than to carry on a side in the College, or a canvass for a Proctor's place in the University.'

For the weakness first. My comprehensions, as narrow as they are, are yet as large as God hath been pleased to make them, and as large as my hard study, accompanied with His grace, hath been able to stretch them; and so large I am sure they are, as that I have ever looked carefully upon the whole Catholic Church of Christ, spread upon the face of the whole earth.

And therefore certainly my comprehensions are not so narrow as theirs, whose largest cannot, or will not, look upon one entire national Church; nay, a parochial is too big for them, and a conventicle big enough. Nor did my 'narrow comprehensions' ever reject that great body, the Catholic Church, out of the Creed, as some of late have done, whose comprehensions are not, for all that, censured by his Lordship for their narrowness.

Next for the fault. That's twofold. First, my compre- 47
hensions went no further (says my Lord) than 'to carry on a side in a College.' Here my Lord is either utterly mistaken, or, which is worse, in a wilful error; for, while I was Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, where I was bred, it is well known I never made nor held up any side. Indeed, when I was chosen President of that College, there was a bitter faction both raised and countenanced against me (I will forbear to relate how and by whom). But this is certain, I made no party then; for four being in nomination for that headship, I lay then so sick at London, that I was neither able to go down, nor so much as write to my friends about it. Yet, after much tumble, a major part of the votes made choice of me. Thus I was chosen President, May 10, 1611[h]. After this my election was quarrelled at, and great means made against me, insomuch that the most gracious king, King James, sat to hear the cause himself, for the space of full three hours, Aug. 28, at Tichburn in Hampshire, as he returned out of the western progress. Upon this hearing, his Majesty approved my election, and commanded my settle-

[h] [See Diary at this date, Works, vol. iii. p. 135.]

ment; which was done accordingly at Michaelmas following. But the faction in the College finding such props above, as they had, continued very eager and bitter against me. The audit of the College for the year's accounts, and choice of new officers, followed in November: there so God blessed me with patience and moderation in the choice of all offices, that I made all quiet in the College. And for all the narrowness of my comprehensions, I governed that College in peace, without so much as the show of a faction, all my time, which was near upon eleven years. And the truth of all this is notoriously known, and many yet living, of great worth in the Church, able and ready to avow it. And this, I hope, was not to lead on a side.

Secondly, my Lord charges my narrow comprehensions as reaching no further than 'a canvass for a Proctor's place.' I was (with thanks to their love that thought me worthy) chose Proctor of the University[i], so soon as by statute I was capable of it; but I never meddled in the managing of the canvass for it for myself, nor afterwards for any other, while I continued Fellow of the College. When I was chosen President, I continued so for two years, and meddled not in that business; and this I did, because in some things I did utterly dislike that canvass, and the carriage of it. At last some of the senior Fellows came to me, and told me that the College had been many years without the credit of a Proctor, and that the Fellows began to take it ill at my hands that I would not show myself, and try my credit and my friends in that business. Upon this, rather than I would lose the love of my companions, I did settle myself in an honest and fair way to right the College as much as I could; and by God's blessing it succeeded beyond expectation[k]. But when we were at the strongest, I made this fair offer more than once and again, that if the greater Colleges would submit to take their turns in order, and not seek to carry all from the lesser, we would agree to any indifferent course in Convocation, and
475 allow the greater Colleges their full proportion according to their number. This would not be hearkened unto; whereupon things continued some years.

[i] [In 1603.]

[k] [Richard Baylie, of St. John's College, was Proctor in 1615. He was, as mentioned above (vol. v. p. 143, note [1]), Laud's principal opponent in his election to the Presidentship.]

After this, by his Majesty's grace and favour, I was made Bishop of St. David's; and after that of Bath and Wells. When I was thus gone out of the University, the election of the Proctors grew more and more tumultuous, till at the last the peace of the University was like to be utterly broken; and the divided parties brought up a complaint to the Council-table. The Lords were much troubled at it, especially the right honourable William, Earl of Pembroke, Lord Steward, and their honourable Chancellor. I had by that time, and by the great grace of his now Majesty, the honour to be a Councillor, and was present. There I acquainted the Lords what offers I had made, during my time in the University, which I did conceive would settle all differences, and make peace for ever. The Lords approved the way; and after the Council was risen, my very honourable Lord the Earl of Pembroke desired me to put the whole business in writing, that he might see and consider of it. I did so: his Lordship approved of it, and sent it to the University, with all freedom to accept or refuse, as they saw cause. The University approved all, only desired the addition of a year or two more to the circle; which would add a turn or two more, to content some of the greater Colleges. This that honourable Lord yielded unto; and that form of election of their Proctors was by unanimous consent made a statute in Convocation, and hath continued the University in peace ever since[1]. And this is all 'the carrying on of a canvass for a Proctor's place' which any truth can challenge me withal. And it may be, my Lord is pleased to impute 'narrow comprehensions' to me, because my advice enclosed the choice of the Proctors within a circle. I am heartily sorry I should trouble the reader with these passages concerning myself; but my Lord forces me to it, by imputing so much unworthiness to me. But my Lord leaves not here, but goes on, and says worse of me:—

Being suddenly advanced to highest places of government in Church and State, had not his heart enlarged by the enlargement of his fortune; but still the maintaining of his party was that which filled all his thoughts; which he prosecuted with so much violence and inconsiderateness,

[1] [See Wood's Annals, ad ann. 1628, 1629, pp. 360, seq.]

that he had not an eye to see the consequences thereof to the Church and State, until he had brought both into those distractions, danger, and dishonour, which we now find ourselves encompassed withal.

The next thing which my Lord charges me with is, that 'I was suddenly advanced to highest places of government in Church and State.' This is like the rest. And I dare say, when my Lord shall better consider of it, he will neither re-affirm nor avouch such an untruth. 'Suddenly advanced!' What does my Lord call 'suddenly?' I was eleven years his Majesty's Chaplain in Ordinary, before I was made a Bishop. I was a Bishop twelve years before I was preferred to be Archbishop of Canterbury, that highest place my Lord mentions. When I was made Archbishop, I was full three-
'6 score years of age, within less than one month. Whereas my immediate predecessor was not any one month in his Majesty's ordinary service as chaplain, but far from that honourable indeed, but yet painful and chargeable service, and was made Bishop of Lichfield, of London, and of Canterbury, within the compass of two years, he being at the time of his translation to Canterbury but forty-nine years of age; and yet never charged as a man 'suddenly advanced.' But my advancement, which it seems pleased not my Lord so well as his did, was very sudden; which I leave to the impartial reader to judge.

Next being advanced to this 'high place,' as my Lord calls it, (but now made low enough by his Lordship, and other of the same feather,) he says, 'I had not my heart enlarged with the enlargement of my fortune.' Sure my Lord is mistaken again. For my heart (I humbly thank God for it) was enlarged every way as much as my fortune, and in some things perhaps more. But it may be my Lord meant, that my heart was not sufficiently enlarged, because I could not receive those separatists into it (further than to pray for them) which would not suffer the open bosom of the Church of England to receive them; but 'neglecting their father's commandment, forsook also their mother's instruction[m].'

Nor did I 'maintain any party;' but any Churchman, or

[m] Prov. i. 8, and vi. 20.

any man else that loved order and peace in the Church, was very welcome to me. And I leave the world to judge, by what they now see, whether I or this Lord have practised or studied most 'the maintenance and advancement of a party.' And as I did not 'maintain a party,' so much less 'did it fill all my thoughts' (as narrow as my Lord thinks them). Nor did I prosecute these or any other my thoughts either with 'violence' or 'inconsiderateness.' Not with 'violence;' for I can name many, of whose preferment, under God and the King, I was cause, who yet went not with them which my Lord will needs miscall 'my party.' Nor did I punish either more, or more severely, any that were brought before me in the Commission, than were punished for the like offences in any the same number of years in my late predecessor's time; as will manifestly appear by the Acts of the Court. Nor with 'inconsiderateness.' For I have many witnesses that mine eye was open, and did plainly see, and as freely tell (where I then hoped there might have been remedy) what was coming both upon Church and State, though not as consequences upon my proceedings; and I wish with all my heart they were no more consequences upon my Lord's proceedings than they have been upon mine.

And my Lord is extremely mistaken, to say that 'I brought both into those distractions, danger, and dishonour, with which they are now encompassed.' For 'tis not I that have troubled this Israel of God. For God is my witness, I laboured nothing but the settlement of the decent external worship of God among us, which, whatever some other men think, I know was sunk very low; and if in labouring this I did err in any circumstance, (for in matter of substance I am sure I did not,) that may be forgiven me for humanity's sake, which cannot free itself from error. But that which brought all these distractions both upon Church and State, was the bringing in of the Scots, and the keeping of them here at a vast charge, only to serve turns, and those very base ones: 47
and to the debasing and dishonour of this whole nation, as well as the King. And how far this Lord had his hand or his head in this treacherous business, he best knows. Sure I am, his Lordship is thought one of the chief moulders of this leaven of the Pharisees. But my Lord thinks himself

safe enough; so he can cry me up among the rabble, to be the author of all. And not content with this, he insults further upon me, as follows:—

Yet, to magnify his moderation, presently after the breaking of the last Parliament, he told a Lord, who sits now in my sight, that if he had been a violent man, he wanted no occasion to show it. For he observed that the Lord Say never came to prayers, and added, that I was in his knowledge as great a separatist as any was in England.

Whatever it was I said, was not 'to magnify my moderation.' Nor do I remember that ever I spake these words. Yet first, if any Lord will say, upon his honour, that I did say these very words, I will bear him and the peerage of the realm that honour, as that I will submit and believe his testimony, against my own old now and weak memory. Next, upon inquiry made by some friends of mine, I find that the words I should speak are said to be these: 'that if I listed to take any advantage against this honourable Lord, I had as much exception to him as to any separatist in England.' These words are neither so bold nor so uncivil as those in the charge; and perhaps I might speak these, though I remember it not. For during the last Parliament, not so few as ten or a dozen several Lords came to me of themselves, as I sat there, and complained grievously of this Lord's absenting himself from the prayers of the Church; and some of them wondered he was not questioned for the scandal he gave by it. And if any of them would be so mean as to urge me to speak, by speaking broad themselves, and then carry the tale to this noble Lord, he did that, whoever he were, which I hope was not the noblest of his actions; and if I did say these latter words of this great Lord, I must and do say them again; and I heartily beseech God that this sin be not laid to my charge, that I questioned him not when the times were calmer; for had I done that, I had done my duty; and if I had not cured him, perhaps I might have prevented so much common danger to this Church, as his Lordship hath procured since that time, both by his example, his counsel, and his countenance. And for the words, I doubt not but he himself will be found to have made them good, before I have done examining

this speech of his Lordship. In the meantime, my Lord proceeds:—

My Lords, how far he hath spit this venom of his against me, I am not certain; but I may well fear, where it might do me greatest prejudice. I shall therefore entreat your Lordships' favour and patience, that I may give you in these things, which so nearly concern me, a true account of myself; which I shall do with ingenuity and clearness, and so as that, if I satisfy not all men, yet I hope I shall make it appear I am not such a one as this waspish man was willing to make the world believe.

I have spit no 'venom' against his Lordship, much less have I spit anything far. For this report, which is here called 'venom,' is common through the kingdom. And I have already told you what divers Lords said to me during the last Parliament. And that is no more than hath been avowed unto me by very many others, and some of very good quality; so the spreading was to me, not from me. But yet, my Lord 'fears I spread it, where it might do him greatest prejudice.' I know not what my Lord means by this, unless it be that I should spread it to his Majesty. And if that be his meaning, I will tell his Lordship truth, what I know therein. I was present when I heard some Lords, more than once, tell the King, that the Lord Say was a separatist from the Church of England, and would not come at her common prayers. And one of these Lords afterwards told me, 'he did conceive it was a great danger to this kingdom, when noblemen should begin to separate in religion; and that his Majesty had need look to it.' To this last, which was spoken to me in private (but I will depose the truth of it), I could not but assent. And to the former I then said, I had heard as much as was then told his Majesty, but I was not certain of it. And I doubt not but these Lords 'sit in his Lordship's sight,' as well as that Lord who told him the other of me: and not in his sight only, but in his affections also, as things go now. But however they carry it with him now, this they said of him then. Nor will I here pick a thanks, to tell this Lord what service I did him to his Majesty, when he was thought to be in danger enough; though I was chidden by a

great one that stood by for my labour. I shall therefore entreat the Christian reader's 'favour and patience,' that having hitherto given him a most true and clear account of that which my Lord charges me with, and doth 'nearly concern' me, so I may proceed to the rest, which I do with all ingenuity and truth. 'And so as that if I satisfy not all men, yet I hope I shall make it appear that I am not such a waspish man' as my Lord would fain render me to the world. But if I have been a wasp in any court, wherein I have had the honour to sit; yet his Lordship should not have called me so, considering what a hornet all men say he is in the Court of Wards [n], and in other places of business: where he pinches so deep, that discreet men are in a doubt whether his aim be to sting the Wards, or the Court itself, to death first. For no man can believe 'tis for the good of the King. And if I fail in this endeavour of mine to clear myself, I must desire the courteous reader to ascribe it, not to my cause, which is very good against his Lordship, but 'to the narrowness of my comprehensions,' and my weakness compared with his Lordship's great abilities. And now my Lord charges as hard as he can. Thus:—

For the first of these which he charges upon me, it may be, he was willing to have it thought that I would not join in prayer with your Lordships, but refused such a communion; which is altogether false. For I should most willingly
79 *join in prayers with you. And further, I will add, that I do not think but some set form of prayers, by some men, in some cases, may be lawfully used.*

For this first; I was not willing to have anything thought of this Lord which is not true; and if it be 'altogether false,' (as his Lordship says it is,) 'that he will not join in prayers with the rest of the Lords in Parliament, but refuses such a communion;' I would fain know why his Lordship doth not join in prayer with them. For most undoubtedly he may if he will. And since it is most true, that he hath not come to prayers in the House with the rest of the Lords, not so much as once, either in the last Parliament, or this; I think it may reasonably be concluded without any falsehood, that his

[n] [He was appointed Master of the Court of Wards, May 17, 1641, in the vain hope of securing his services to the King.]

Lordship 'will not join,' no, not in 'such a communion' with them. Where it is to be observed, he says, he 'refuses not such a communion with them.' He refuses not; yet he will not join: and 'he refuses not such a communion.' A communion I have cause to doubt he doth refuse; but not such a communion as goes no further than prayers; yet to these he comes not. At the sacrament, I believe he will be more scrupulous, of whom, or with whom, he receives that.

Indeed, his Lordship adds, that 'he would most willingly join in prayers with their Lordships.' And though this be most strange, that he should never do that, which he would most willingly do, an opportunity being offered him every day: yet, my Lord is pleased to add further, what his judgment is 'of set forms of prayer.' And he tells you, that he thinks 'some set forms, by some men, in some occasions may be lawfully used.' Surely, the Church of England is much beholding to this Lord; very much, and the State too. For the set 'forms of prayer' which she enjoins, were compiled by some of those who suffered no less than martyrdom for the reformation of religion: the same form of prayer was established by Act of Parliament: and yet, as if Church and State were all at a loss, this noble Lord, who confesses 'some set forms lawful,' condemns this form, by his actions at least, in continual and professed abstaining from it. 'Some forms,' but not this; by 'some men,' but not these; in 'some cases,' but not in God's public service in the Church, 'may be lawfully used.' And yet for all these petty 'somes' of restraint, I know his Lordship's parts so great, that I dare not say (as he says of me) that his Lordship is of 'narrow comprehensions.' But his Lordship will now tell us, what that is, in which he is not satisfied.

But this is that which I am not satisfied in, that a certain number of men should usurp an authority unto themselves, to frame certain prayers, and forms of divine service; and when that is done, under the name of the Church to enjoin them upon all persons, in all times, and upon all occasions, to be used, and no other. And upon this ground, (which makes it the worse,) because these come from the public spirit of the Church, (when the bishop or

his Chaplain shall frame them,) and others proceed from the private spirit of this or that particular man.

Now, truly, since my Lord does not think 'some set forms of prayer unlawful,' I am very sorry his Lordship is not satisfied 'that a certain number of men should frame these forms of divine service.' For all Churchmen cannot possibly meet about that, or any other Church affair; nor can any synod or assembly be called, but there must be 'some certain number of them.' Nor do these 'men usurp any authority to themselves herein:' for in all ages of the Church, from Christ downward, all set forms of prayer, used in any Church, have been either made by 'a certain number of men,' or approved by them, when some eminent servant of God hath composed them first, and then tendered them to the judgment of the Church. And it is very necessary that it should be so. 'Nor would the Church of old admit any prayers in the public service and worship of God; but such as were so made, and so approved; lest through ignorance, or want of care and circumspection, something might slip in that was contrary to the faith [o].' But I fear here's *anguis in herba* [p]. And that my Lord is not satisfied, not so much because these set forms are made by 'a set number of men,' as because they are Churchmen, though he be shy to express it. And if that be his meaning, he must rest unsatisfied still. For Churchmen, and none but Churchmen, must actually do public Church-work, according to their calling, and their warrant. And yet, I hope, Churchmen will never be so proud, but that if any lay religious man, of 'larger comprehensions than themselves,' will offer in private any help to them, they will lend an open ear to it, and after, with a prudent consideration, do what is fit.

And as this Lord is not satisfied, that 'a certain number of men' should make these set forms; so much less is he satisfied, that when this is done, 'they should under the name of the Church, enjoin them upon all persons, in all times, and upon all occasions, to be used, and no other.' No

[o] "Nec aliæ (preces) omnino dicantur in Ecclesia, nisi quæ a prudentioribus traditæ [*leg.* tractatæ] vel comprobatæ in Synodo fuerint; ne forte aliquid contra fidem, vel per ignorantiam, vel per minus studium sit compositum."—Concil. Milevita. II. can. 12. [Conc. tom. ii. col. 1540. E.]

[p] [Virg. Ecl. iii. 93.]

set forms, that I know, are enjoined 'under the name of the Church,' but such as the Church in Synod hath approved, or tolerated till a Synod may be called. And when any national Church, in a kingdom that is Christian, hath approved a set form; yet that cannot be enjoined upon all persons, till the sovereign power in that state hath weighed, approved, and commanded it. But then, though framed by 'a certain number of men,' that, and no other, lays hold 'on all persons, and in all times, and upon all occasions' that are public; if men will live in obedience to the Church and State. I say public, leaving 'all persons, at all times,' free to use any form of prayer agreeable to the foundations of Christian religion, which shall best serve their several private occasions.

And therefore I conceive, my Lord is in a great error in that which he adds next; namely, 'that this ground makes it the worse, because these set forms are said to come from the public spirit of the Church.'

I cannot think so hardly of my Lord, as if he could like a set form of prayer the worse, because it comes 'from the public spirit of the Church.' And therefore I will take his words in another sense, (though they be in my judgment very obscurely set down,) and perhaps that is his Lordship's meaning: that 'it makes the matter the worse, because these 481
forms of prayer come as from the public spirit of the Church, when it is but the bishop or his chaplain, or some private spirit, that frames them.' If this be my Lord's meaning; far be it from me, or any other, to impose any form of set prayers upon the Church. But it is one thing to 'impose,' and quite another to 'compose' a set form of prayer. 'Impose,' none can but just authority. 'Compose,' all together cannot; but some one or more must be singled out to take that pains. And all or most may approve, what one or few have compiled. When it is so approved, then it can no more be said to proceed from 'any private spirit of this or that man, be it the bishop or his chaplain;' but from the spirit and power of the Church. My Lord himself being a prudent man, hath had the happiness to make motions in Parliament, which have taken the House, been approved, and orders drawn up upon them: when the order is so agreed on, no man

may say, it is an order of my Lord's 'private spirit,' but the order of the House, and approved by the 'public spirit,' and imposed by the public authority of the State. And therefore to me it seems strange, that my Lord, who understands these things so well, should neither like of a set form of prayers, composed by private men, nor by 'a certain number of men,' and after publicly confirmed. Sure, this would make any man think my Lord likes none, however he minces it. But my Lord goes further, and says,—

> *This injunction is an usurpation of power over the Churches of Christ, and over the gifts and graces which Christ hath given unto men; which the Apostles never exercised, nor would assume. And yet they might much better have done it. And the same reasons might have been alleged for it that are now. This turns such forms, instead of being directions, into superstition.*

It seems by this (for I am most willing to take my Lord's meaning at the fairest) that my Lord can digest 'some set forms of prayer;' but he would have no 'injunction' upon them. So he that would use them might, and he that would not might choose; and this in short time would bring mere confusion into the Church of God, which I hope is not my Lord's intention to do. Besides, my Lord cannot but know that 'this injunction for our set forms of service' comes not from the Church's direction and constitution, (though her wisdom and piety framed it,) but from the authority and power of King and Parliament. So that all the arguments which his Lordship brings here against the Church, are equally, if not more, set against the King and the Parliament. Well; why then is not an injunction of set form of prayers fit? Why, my Lord tells you: First, because 'it is an usurpation of power over the Churches of Christ.' 'Tis indeed an act of power, but no usurpation. The Church directing, and the Sovereign enacting, ever had this power since States became Christian. And should I have called it an 'usurpation of power,' his Lordship, I fear, would have called it treason against the King's supremacy. But I doubt my Lord would have the Churches free from regal power having aught to do with them, durst he speak out.

Secondly, because it's 'an usurpation of power over the gifts and graces which God hath given unto men.' Not so neither. For whatsoever gifts or graces God hath given unto 482
men, they may all have time, place, and occasions enough, to use them to God's glory, and the comfort of themselves and others; and yet in the public service of God, submit to that set form of God's worship, which is enjoined for unity and decency in that external service. So this lays no restraint upon the 'gifts and graces' of pious and religious men: but it keeps off bold, ignorant, and audacious men, from 'foaming out their own shame[q],' to the great disorder and scandal of the Church of Christ. As we may see at this day, now that injunction begins to be but a little loosed, what froth and base stuff is preached to the consciences of men. And yet these men, which preach thus scandalously, talk of 'gifts and graces;' none more.

Thirdly, because 'the Apostles never exercised, nor would assume this power of enjoining a set form, and yet they might better have done it.' But how doth my Lord know the Apostles never exercised, nor would assume this power? Out of all doubt the Apostles did exercise and assume many things, which are not come down to our knowledge. And since the Apostles did enjoin a form of doctrine to the Church of Rome[r], and delivered it too. And since St. Paul enjoined the Church at Philippi, to 'walk by a set rule,' (for a rule it cannot be, unless it be set,) 'that so they might learn to mind the same things[s],' Phil. iii. And a form of ordination by imposition of hands[t], 1 Tim. v., for such persons as should instruct the people in these things. And this with a stiff injunction, v. 21, and 'a form of wholesome words[u],' 2 Tim. i. And since St. John the Baptist taught his disciples to pray[v], St. Luke xi.;—and that it was by some set form of prayer, I have some reason to think. First, because if they did pray by the motion of the Spirit only, St. John could not teach them that, but the Spirit only. So either St. John taught them not at all to pray, which I hope this Lord will not say against a plain text; or else he taught

[q] [Jude, ver. 13.]
[r] Rom. vi. 17.
[s] Phil. iii. 16.
[t] 1 Tim. v. 22.
[u] 2 Tim. i. 13.
[v] St. Luke xi. 1.

them some set form, which was in his power and theirs, to teach and learn. Secondly, because Christ's disciples seem to intimate so much. For they desire Christ to 'teach them to pray, as St. John taught his disciples [w].' And Christ instantly granting their request, taught them a set form of prayer: therefore it is more than probable, that St. John taught his so too, though the form be not recorded in Scripture. Upon all which laid together, it is probable enough (by my Lord's leave) that the Apostles did 'exercise' some set form, that at least which Christ taught them. And 'assumed' power to enjoin it upon their followers. But herein yet the Apostles are somewhat beholding to this Lord, that he reallows, 'they might better have done it' than any nowadays. Well; I will not dispute what they might better have done; sure I am, it may and ought to be done now.

Fourthly, because 'the same reasons might then have been alleged for it, that are now.' The same might, but not all the same. In particular, the Church was small then, and might with ease be ordered, in comparison of the great congregations that are now. But especially the Apostles and Apostolical men were then present, and could in another manner, and with a greater power than men nowadays, both judge and order the 'gifts and graces of other men,' to the avoiding of confusion in the Church, which God by His Apostles would none of [x]. 1 Cor. xiv.

33 Besides, the Apostles and some others in those times had the grace and the gift of prayer, as well as other graces. And there was then as peculiar a gift by inspiration to pray, as to foretell things to come, or to do miracles: as is evident in St. Chrysostom, who says that 'these men made use of this gift, and prayed publicly in their assemblies [y].' But so soon as this gift with others ceased, there was a set form from the beginning. Neither is it hard to prove, that some parts of our Liturgy hath been as ancient as the Church hath any records to show, and some both practised and prescribed by

[w] [St. Luke xi.] 2.

[x] 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

[y] [Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολλὰ τῶν συμφερόντων ἡμῖν ἀγνοοῦντες τὰ μὴ συμφέροντα αἰτοῦμεν, ἤρχετο χάρισμα εὐχῆς εἰς ἕνα τινὰ τῶν τότε, καὶ τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἁπάσης αὐτός τε ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων ἴατατο αἴτ^ν, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπαίδευε.] —St. Chrysost. in Rom. viii. 26. [Op., tom. ix. p. 586. B. Ed. Bened.]

the Apostle St. Paul for the substance of them. And the true reason why we cannot show the exact primitive forms then in use is, because they were continually subject to alterations both in times and places. Now, if this Lord can furnish us with such men, as shall be enabled to pray by the immediate inspiration of God's Spirit, we will bind them up to no form. But, till he can, I hope we shall be so happy as to retain the set prayers of the Church.

Fifthly, because 'this (enjoining) turns such forms, instead of being directions, into superstition.' This is so wild a conceit, that I wonder how it fell into the thought of so wise a man as my Lord is taken to be. For can a command or an injunction alter the very nature of a thing so far, as to turn that which is a direction into a superstition? Then belike it is superstition for any Christian to obey the decrees and injunctions, whether for belief or practice, made by any the four first General Councils. And my Lord knows well that 'tis heretical for any man to profess against any of these Councils, and this not only by the Church law, (which his Lordship so much slights,) but by the laws of England[z]. So by this reason of my Lord's, it shall be heretical to deny the injunction, and superstition to obey it.

If this will not serve, my Lord may be pleased to remember that in the Council held at Jerusalem by the Apostles themselves[a], they gave a command, though no such command as might trouble the believing Gentiles; and therefore decreed that they would lay no greater burthen on them, no more grievous injunction, than 'that they abstain from things offered unto idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication[b].' Where, first, it is most evident that the Apostles did 'assume' this power of enjoining, and 'exercise' it too. And I hope my Lord, for very reverence to the Scripture, (for as for the Church, he valueth it not,) will not say this wholesome direction to avoid fornication is made superstition by the Apostles' injunction. If this doctrine may hold, I doubt very few will be superstitious in this point. And many men that are very strict, and hate superstition perfectly, will rather not abstain from fornication, than be

[z] 1 Eliz. c. 1. [a] Acts xv. 24, 29. [b] Ver. 28.

superstitious by abstaining. And no question can be made by a reasonable man, but that the Church of Christ had and hath still as much power to enjoin a set form of prayers as any of these things. But my Lord hath more reasons than these, and truly they had need be better too; but such as they are, they follow:—

This sets aside the gifts and graces which Christ hath given, and thrusts out the exercise of them, to substitute in their places and introduce a device of man.

4 Sixthly, then, this injunction of a set form is unlawful, because 'it sets aside the gifts and graces,' &c. This is upon the matter all one with my Lord's second reason; and there 'tis answered. Yet truly I know no 'gifts or graces set aside, much less thrust out,' but such as are neither gifts nor graces of Christ, but the bold and impudent attempts of weavers, cobblers, and felt-makers, taking on them to preach without knowledge, warrant, or calling. Much like the gifts which Alexander the coppersmith had in St. Paul's time. And such gifts and graces as these cannot be said to be 'thrust out.' But my Lord and his adherents thrust them into the Church, to help cry down all truth and order. Much less can they be said to be 'thrust out to make room for a device of man,' meaning the set form of Common Prayer. Now surely I think, and upon very good grounds, that they which composed the Common Prayer-book, had as good gifts and graces of Christ as these men have; and that the conceived and oftentimes senseless prayers of these men, are as much or more the 'device of man' than the set form of Common Prayer is. Yea, but for all that, my Lord says:—

This injunction of such forms upon all men, turns that which in the beginning necessity brought in for the help of insufficiency, to be now the continuance and maintenance of insufficiency, and a bar to the exercise of able and sufficient gifts and graces. As if, because some men had need to make use of crutches, all men should be prohibited the use of their legs, and enjoined to take up such crutches as have been prepared for those who had no legs.

In the seventh and last place, my Lord is pleased to tell us,

'This injunction of such forms upon all men, turns that which in the beginning necessity brought in for the help of insufficiency, to the maintenance of it.' My Lord told us a little before, of a 'turning into superstition:' now here's another 'turning into the maintenance of insufficiency;' two very bad turnings, were either of them true. But God be thanked neither is. In the meantime, my Lord confesses that necessity brought in this injunction of set forms. And I believe there now is, and ever will be to the end of the world, as great a necessity to continue them. But I cannot agree with my Lord in this, that it was 'a necessity for the help of insufficiency' that brought them in; for when these were first enjoined in the Church of Christ, men were endued with as great gifts and graces as any now are, and perhaps greater. But necessity brought them in when Christianity multiplied, to preserve unity and order, and to avoid confusion, and sects and schisms in the Church, and that all sorts of men might be acquainted with that which was used in the public worship and service of God.

Now that which follows is an unjust and foul scandal upon the Church; namely, 'that this injunction is made the continuance and maintenance of insufficiency.' For I believe few Churches in many ages have had more sufficient preachers than this of late hath had; and therefore 'tis evident, this injunction here hath neither been the 'maintenance' nor 'continuance of insufficiency.' This ground failing, my Lord's 48
fine simile hath neither crutch nor leg to stand on; but it is as all such fine fetches are, when they have no ground to rest on. Nor is any thing more poor in learning than a fine, handsome similitude such as this, when it hath no truth upon which to rest; for the best that can be said of it is, that it is a pretty fine thing, if it were to the purpose.

But to come nearer to the business; I would have his Lordship remember, that Christ taught His Apostles a set form of prayer, St. Luc. xi.[c]; and I believe they were so religiously dutiful, as that they would not beg of Christ to teach them to pray, and when He had taught them, then neglect or not practise the very form He taught. If my Lord can think this of the Apostles, he may; I cannot. Nor can

[c] St. Luc. xi. 2.

I think that Christ taught them this form, to be used as crutches till their legs were grown stronger. For our Saviour doth not say, till ye be stronger, and have better gifts, pray as I teach you; but simply and absolutely, 'When you pray, say, Our Father,' &c.: that is, say these very words, this very form. And what? will my Lord say that Christ taught them this form to maintain them in insufficiency? Or did He make crutches for their lameness? Or thereby prohibit the use of their legs? This speech savours of more profaneness than well becomes such a professor.

His Lordship speaks better of them in another place. There he can say, 'There never were, nor ever will be, men of so great abilities and gifts as they were endued withal[d].' And I think he dares not say, I am sure, nor he, nor any man living can prove, that the Apostles, when their gifts were at fullest, did neglect or not use this form of prayer which Christ taught them. Therefore, either to use a set form of prayer is not to use crutches; or if it be, 'tis to use the same, or the like crutches which Christ made, and His Apostles used. And they will better beseem any good Christians to use, than his own legs, be they never so good. And for the set prayers of the Church, this I think I am sure of, that the men which are cried up by my Lord to have such excellent gifts and graces, are in as much need of these crutches as other men. In the meantime, my Lord every way shows his love to the set Liturgy of the Church, that makes nothing of it but crutches, which a man, if the bath cure him, would gladly hang up and leave behind him. I well hoped to have found that my Lord had entertained more moderate thoughts of things appertaining unto religion; but since he himself thus proclaims it otherwise, let us see how he goes forward without these crutches.

This, I confess, I am not satisfied in; yet will further say thus much. Here are with your Lordships some Bishops, men of great parts, able to offer up this worship unto God, in the use of those gifts which God hath endued them with. And certainly they ought to serve Him with the best of their abilities which they have received. Let them make

[d] In his Speech against the Bishops' Votes in Parliament, p. 3. [Lond. 1641.]

use of their own gifts; nay, let them but profess that they account not themselves bound to use forms, nor to this form they use, more than any other, but that it is free for them to conceive prayer, or to help themselves by the use of any other form they please, as well as this prescribed. And let them practise the same indifferently, that so it may be 486 *manifest the fault rests in the person, and not in the service; in the negligence of him that may offer better if he will, not in the injunction of that which is offered. And I will not refuse to come to prayers. For I take the sin then to be personal, and to reside in the person officiating only.*

Now, my Lord goes on further, and tells us 'that there are with your Lordships some Bishops, men of great parts, able to offer this worship unto God,' &c. Indeed, my Lord goes far here; and I am glad to hear that any Bishops can please him. Are Bishops, even as such, members of Antichrist (so I am sure my Lord and his followers have accounted them, and their libels print them for such every day); and now can any 'offer this worship unto God' which his Lordship would have? Why, then, my Lord can be pleased, I see, that even in this Church God should be worshipped by the members of Antichrist; or if not, then in this passage he grossly dissembles.

But what is this worship which his Lordship would have? Why, it is to pray in public, and not by a set form enjoined, but 'in the use of those gifts which God hath endued them with.' And it is most undoubtedly true which follows, 'that they ought to serve God with the best of the abilities they have received;' but 'tis as true that Bishops, and all ministers else, ought to serve God with the best abilities which the Church of Christ can furnish them with. And I presume I shall not wrong any my brethren, not those of the greatest parts, if I say (as I must) that those Bishops and other divines which composed the set form of our service, and enjoined it too (as far as their power reached), were men of as great piety and learning, and all other good parts, as any now living. And it can be no disparagement, much less any fault or dulling of their own gifts, for the best of Bishops to use the set forms ordered by them. And the phrase which my

Lord uses is somewhat unusual: 'to offer this worship unto God.' We are said, indeed, to offer up our prayers unto God, and by so doing to worship, honour, and serve Him, and Him alone in that. But to offer worship to God, I think, is an improper phrase at least. And Psal. cx.[e] the people are said 'to offer their freewill offerings with an holy worship,' or 'in the beauties of holiness:' and though, perhaps, his Lordship will not allow of this translation, yet so far he may as to see the use of the phrase. And 'in the beauties of holiness[f],' (which keeps close to the original,) will please him less; since a barn with them is as good as a church; and no church holy with them, but that which is slovenly even to nastiness; but then 'tis void of all superstition.

Next, my Lord proposes some conditions, which being observed, his Lordship will not refuse to come to common-prayer.

I'll examine these, then; for I would have all just demands of his granted, that he may come.

1. The first is, 'Let these Bishops' (and others I suppose he means) 'make use of their own gifts.' Well, let them on God's name, in that dutiful, peaceable, and orderly way, make use of their own gifts, not crossing what the Church justly prescribes.

87 2. Secondly, 'Let them but profess, that they account not themselves bound to use forms.' This condition is somewhat hard. For if they shall acknowledge they hold themselves bound to no forms, they must be bound to no order: and how Bishops will keep the Church in order, if they will be bound to observe none themselves, I cannot tell. Besides, if they shall profess this, they must profess against the constant and continued practice of the whole Church of Christ.

3. Thirdly, 'Let them profess they are not bound to this form they use more than any other, but that it is free for them to conceive prayer,' &c. Harder and harder. For they stand bound not only by Church-ordinance, but by injunction, and command of the State in Parliament, strictly to observe this form. And they are therefore bound to this form more than any other. And therefore so long as this

[e] Psal. cx. 3.
[f] 'In decoribus sanctitatis.' Ar. Mont. Ibid. [p. 42. Antv. 1584.]

Act of Parliament remains in force, with what honour of conscience can this Lord (who seems to stand so much upon law) ask this at the Bishops' hands, that they should profess that they are not bound to any forms? Nor, to this more than any other; when his Lordship must needs know they are bound to this, and no other, and that by an Act of Parliament? Besides, what a coil hath been kept by some of this Lord's favourites, against innovations of religion, as contrary to law! No rails to fence the holy table from profanation; though that be no ceremony, nor forbidden by law. No coming up to it, or the steps of the chancel, to receive the Communion; though most decent, and in ancient usage, and forbidden by no law that I know. No reverence to God Himself at coming in or going out of His temple; though that of the Psalmist began the ancient Liturgies of the Church, and is continued in our 'O come, let us worship and fall down, and kneel before the Lord our Maker,' &c. Psal. xcv.[g] The communion-table must not stand north and south, though the Queen's Injunction commanded it to be set just in that place in which the altar then stood[h]. So they innovate themselves, and then cry out of innovation. And if this Lord's doctrine be good, let's have no injunction for north and south, and all's well. But then we must have no injunction for east and west neither. For, if there be an injunction, east and west is superstition, as well as north and south.

But then, if my Lord would have all free, what would he have in this particular? Why, first, he would have it 'free for these men to conceive prayer.' Let them in due time and place 'conceive prayer' on God's name: but let them not make public abortion in the Church. 'Tis an over-hasty mother, that brings forth so soon as she has conceived: and yet, extemporary men outrun these mothers; and conceive and bring forth their unnatural monsters, both at once.

Next, he would have 'these men to help themselves by the use of any other forms they please, as well as this which is prescribed.' So then belike, these great 'men of gifts' in my Lord's eye, are not so perfect in the Spirit, but that they may need helps. And if my Lord be so indifferent, that these may

[g] Psal. xcv. 6.
[h] [See Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. p. 188.]

help 'themselves by the use of any other forms, as well as this which is prescribed,' let him be as fair, at least, to the Church that made him a Christian, as to others; and give men leave to help themselves, by the use of this form which is prescribed, as well [as] any other. And if it be the injunction only that sticks in his stomach, I am sorry he should show himself so guilty of the great sin of disobedience.

4. Fourthly, 'Let them practise the same indifferently, that so it may be manifest the fault rests in the person, and not in the service,' &c. This is his Lordship's last condition. And either I am dulled with this business, or the expression is somewhat obscure: but I will take it as right as I can. It seems, my Lord would not refuse coming to the prayers of the Church, for the personal fault of him that officiates. And that's well. It seems, likewise, that to manifest this, whether the sin lies in the person that offers, or in the service that is offered up, his Lordship would have an indifferent practice of that which is enjoined, and other forms. And that's stark naught. For by this we shall have no certain service of God for the people. It shall differ, and perhaps more dangerously than is fit, not only in different parishes, but in the same congregation at different times. And were not this so, yet I cannot assent to my Lord in this, that these men he means can so easily offer better if they will, and that when they do not, it is their negligence that is the only cause. And besides, it is useless: for it is known already to sober minds, that the fault (when any arises in that work) is neither in the service, which is very good; nor in the injunction, which is very lawful; but in the person which officiates, if he do not his duty: and so there is no need of a confused practising of divers forms indifferently, to manifest that which is known already. And if my Lord brings no worse sins about him when he comes to church, than he will find faults in the Liturgy, he may safely come to church, and be a happy man in so doing. And I might well doubt of my Lord's meaning herein, for himself is jealous of his auditors. Therefore he adds:—

I know not whether I express myself clearly, to be understood in this, or not; and it may seem to be a nice scrupulosity:

give me leave, therefore, to endeavour to clear it by an instance ortwo.

Truly my Lord takes himself right. For neither hath he expressed himself very clearly, nor is the matter so material in itself, but that it may be, as it seems, 'a very nice scrupulosity,' and altogether unable to warrant his Lordship's separation from the prayers of the Church. Yet since my Lord desires to 'clear it by an instance or two,' I shall be well content to hear and consider of them. His first instance is,—

In the time of the Law, when God appointed Himself to be worshipped by offerings and sacrifices, the shadows and types of those truths which were to come, if a poor man, which had not ability to bring a bullock, or a ram, or a lamb, had brought a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, it would have been in him an acceptable service. But if a man of ability, who had herds and flocks, should out of negligence or covetousness, have spared the cost of a bullock or ram, and brought young pigeons, his service would have been rejected, and himself punished. How much more would the service have been abomination, if men should have taken authority to have enjoined all to 489 *bring no other but turtles or young pigeons, because some were not able to do more? In one kind there might be a tolerable and lawful* [*use*] *of that which otherways used,* (*especially if generally enjoined*) *would have been most unlawful. God will be worshipped with the fat and best of the inwards, the best of men's gifts and abilities, which he that worships, or officiates in worshipping, is to do at his own peril. And if it be left free unto him, the worship may be lawful to him that joineth with him therein, in itself, though performed in a negligent, and so in a sinful manner, by the minister. But if that manner be enjoined, the service itself is to be refused.*

This is my Lord's first instance from the services under the Law. And I must needs say, he hath made it clear what he would have. But then he must give me leave to say too that this instance differs so mainly from the thing in que

tion, that it helps my Lord and his cause in nothing. Perhaps it makes it worse than it was.

The difference is: God in the Law did not only prescribe all the sacrifices and offerings which He would have, and for what; but also when, and how He would have them. And the poor man which had not ability to bring the greater sacrifice, might, by the express letter of the Law, bring turtles or pigeons[i], Levit. v. 'But if a rich man had brought them, his service would have been rejected, and himself punished.' So says my Lord: but the Law says not so. He that brought it should have borne his sin, and the priest could have made no atonement for him, which was punishment enough. But that he should any other way be punished, I find not in the text of the Law. And this Lord, which will admit of nothing but text, should not presume to add anything to it. The Rabbins[j], indeed, reckon up six-and-thirty kinds of offenders, which for their sins are threatened to be cut off from their people; and some are mentioned[k], Levit. vii. and xvii. But none of these mentioned in Leviticus, or by the Rabbins, is the rich man's offering turtles or pigeons, instead of a bullock or a ram. Well, this was the strict prescription of sacrifices and offerings in the Law. But in the Gospel, though Christ settled His doctrine and sacraments, yet when, and how, with other ceremonial things, were left at large to the ordering of the Apostles, and the Church after them, always providing for decency and order. And this liberty was left as much, if not more, in preaching and public prayer, than in the sacraments. And therefore my Lord's instance in this way will not follow from the Law to the Gospel.

To give instance in his own words. In the Law, 'the poor man which had nor bullock, nor lamb, might by the express warrant of the Law bring turtles or pigeons,' but they were to be his own which he brought, and the priest was to make his atonement accordingly. But in the Gospel men do not bring to the priest or minister their own doctrines, or their prayers; but he offers in public the sermon to them, and the prayers for them. So here the instance comes not home neither.

[i] Levit. v. 7.

[j] Apud Ainsworth in Levit. xx. 3. [p. 121, Lond. 1639.]

[k] Levit. vii. 25, and Levit. xvii. 4, 9, 10.

As for my Lord's aggravation; 'How much more would the service have been abomination, if men should have taken authority to themselves, and have enjoined all to bring 490 nothing but turtles or pigeons?' Indeed it would have been full of abomination, because in this injunction they would have gone quite contrary to God's own command. And let my Lord show in the Gospel any precept that commands men to use extemporary or conceived prayers in the public service or worship of God, or that forbids the use of a set form of prayer, and then I will grant the Church's injunction of such forms to be in the highest degree unlawful. But these cannot be showed.

Besides, there is a great deal of pride in this instance. For my Lord all along the instance makes the set forms of the Church, turtles and pigeons, the poor man's sacrifice; and the conceived prayers of his party to be the rich and able men's sacrifice, the ram and the bullock (the calf I doubt it is). So a very little before his Lordship tells us of a negligence in those his 'men of gifts, which might offer better if they will.' As if it were a most easy thing for those men to offer up far better prayers to God, than the set Liturgy of the Church. Whereas my Lord must give me leave to doubt that, even of the best of them. And so again a little after, his Lordship tells us, 'that God will be worshipped with the fat and the best of the inwards,' which he interprets, 'with the best of men's gifts and abilities;' and of this there is no doubt. Nor doth the enjoining of a set form of public prayer hinder any man from worshipping God with the best gifts and abilities which he hath. And who should be served with the best, if not He that gave them all? But here 's the pride of the instance again. Their conceived, tedious, and ofttimes senseless prayers, must be the 'fat and the inwards' with which God is pleased; and the set forms of the Church lean carrion, and not fit for the altar. O, my Lord, that you would in time lay your hand on your heart, and consider from what, and into what you are fallen!

My Lord concludes this instance with this, 'That if it be left free to him that officiates, 'tis his personal sin if he be negligent; but it may be lawful for another that joins with him in that service: but if that manner be enjoined, the

service itself is to be refused.' And after this great pride in, or of this opinion, my Lord ends with a fallacy[1]. For the question is not, whether a negligent set form of prayer, or a good form of set prayer negligently and without devotion offered up to God (as too often they are, God help us), be better than other prayers, carefully composed and devoutly uttered? but simply, whether a good set form of prayer (such as the Liturgy of England is) be made so evil, only by the enjoining of it, as that therefore the service itself ought to be refused? Now this my Lord may say as boldly as he will; but neither he nor any man else shall ever be able to prove it.

And in this very close, I cannot but observe that which in me or another man would have been great pride: but what it is in this Lord, let the reader judge. For he doth not conclude that this form being enjoined, is the cause why he refuses to come to our prayers. But absolutely, as if all men were bound to do as he doth. He says peremptorily, that in this case of injunction of a set form, 'the service itself ought to be refused.' So that by this doctrine, he is a sinner that refuses not the prayers of the Church of England. My Lord in the
91 beginning asked leave to speak a few words concerning himself; but I believe these will be found to concern somebody else. Well, 'tis time to consider of my Lord's second instance; and so I will.

Now in the time of the Gospel, God hath appointed the foolishness of preaching (for so the world accounts it) to be the means by which He will save those that believe. I conceive, where there are not gifts enabling men to preach, there might be a lawful and profitable use of reading of printed sermons and homilies; and in such cases they might very lawfully be heard. But if some men, upon pretence to prevent extravagant preaching, should take upon them to set forth a book of public common sermons, fit for all times and occasions; and should enjoin ministers to conform to these, and use no other preaching at all,

[1] 'Tis *fallacia accidentis:* for it is not in, or of the nature of prayer, that it should be in a negligent form set down, or negligently performed; but a mere accident, and a bad one.

but the reading of those common sermons or homilies so devised for public worship; this would make it utterly unlawful, and to be professed against, as that which were the bringing in of a human device and injunction in the place and instead of God's ordinance, to the exclusion thereof. As the Pharisees, to establish traditions of their own, made void the commandments of God.

I hope, my Lord will have no better success with this instance under the Gospel, than he had with that under the Law. And yet whatsoever is truth in his instance, I shall most willingly grant. And therefore I do acknowledge, that 'in the time of the Gospel, God appointed the foolishness of preaching [m],' 1 Cor. i., to be 'a means;' but 'not to be the means' (if it be meant the only means) 'by which He will save those that believe.' I likewise confess, that in 'the world's account 'tis made the foolishness of preaching.' And I would to God some men, much magnified in these times, did not give too often very just cause to the world to account it, not only the 'foolishness,' but the madness of preaching; such 'preaching' as is far from being 'a means of salvation.' I conceive also, as well as my Lord, 'that where there are no gifts enabling men to preach,' (as it falls out in too many parishes in England, and the true cause is, the smallness of the living, unable to feed and clothe men, and therefore cannot expect men of parts,) there not only might be, but is 'a lawful and profitable use of reading of printed sermons and homilies; and that in such cases,' yes, and in other cases too, 'they may very lawfully be heard.' And I think further, that if 'some men,' not upon their own private authority, but lawfully meeting in a synod or convocation, shall 'not upon pretence,' but truly, 'to prevent extravagant preaching,' such as of late hath been, and is too common in England, 'should take upon them to set forth a book of common sermons, such as might be fit for all times and all occasions,' which is not impossible to be done, 'and should enjoin ministers to conform to these, and use no other preaching at all, but the reading of these common sermons or homilies so devised for public worship;' I must needs say, it were a cure not to be

[m] 1 Cor. i. 21.

used but in extremity, to bar all other preaching for the abuse of some, be it never so gross. Yet if the distempers of the pulpit should grow in any national Church so high, so seditious, so heretical and blasphemous, so schismatical and
92 outrageous, as many of them have been of late in this distracted Church of ours; I say, if such 'a book of sermons' should be so set out, by the Church direction, and published by the authority of King and Parliament, as the Book of Common Prayer is: when the comparison is made thus even, and my Lord's instance so brought home[n]: I do then think, such a book, not 'devised for public worship,' but for 'public instruction,' (for sermons are not properly the worship of God, but to teach us faith and obedience, and how we are to pray and give worship to Him,) might be used with great profit; yea, and with far more than many sermons of the present time, which do in a manner teach nothing but disobedience to princes and all authority, under a false pretence of obedience to God.

And for the 'injunction,' which sticks so much with my Lord; certainly in cases of such extremity, as is above mentioned, and when nothing else will serve, I conceive it might well and profitably be laid upon the ministers; and yet that such an 'imposition' would be far 'from making it utterly unlawful, and to be professed against, as that which were the bringing in of a human device in the place and instead of God's ordinance, to the exclusion thereof.' For 'tis probable these sermons my Lord speaks of, would be preached before they were printed. And the end of their being preached was to publish Christ and His Gospel to the world. And that also was or ought to be the end of publishing the same sermons in print, that the benefit of them might reach the further, and be of longer continuance. So that upon the matter, 'the printing of sermons' is but a large and more open preaching of them still. And then if preaching be 'God's ordinance,' printing of sermons is the 'publishing of

[n] In the Church of Africa, when the Arian heresy began, the Church had suffered so much by the preaching of Arius the presbyter, that they made a law not to suffer any presbyter to preach at all, at least not in the mother Church, and in the Bishop's presence. As may be seen in Socrates, lib. v. Hist. cap. 22. And though this may seem a hard cure, yet when the disease grew masterful and epidemical, the Church did not refuse to use it.

God's ordinance.' And therefore, if there were 'an injunction for a book of sermons,' as is mentioned, it were but a more public and durable divulging of 'God's ordinance;' and not 'the bringing in of a human device instead of it, and to the exclusion thereof.'

As for that which follows, 'that this is like the Pharisees, who, to establish traditions of their own, made void the commandments of God,' this is but a simile, and is answered in the former. And you see that should any necessity force the making of such an injunction (which God forbid), it did help to publish God's ordinance, and not make void His commandments. Howsoever, my Lord may take this along with him: that that party which he governs in this kingdom, are as well seen in this art of the Pharisees as any men in Christendom; and will, if they be let alone, make void all the service of God, to bring in their dreams, against all reason, religion and lawful authority. And this is most true, whatever they think of themselves. But my Lord desires further consideration of his instance:—

> *Let it be considered, what difference can be found between these, but only this. Use and custom hath inured us to that of prayer, not so in this of preaching; and therefore the evil of it would easily appear unto us, if so enjoined.*

It is fit my Lord should have his desire in this, 'that it be considered what difference can be found between these:' and out of all doubt my Lord acknowledges, that some difference 498
there is. And were it 'this only,' as his Lordship would have it, 'that use and custom hath inured us to that of prayer, and not so in this of preaching;' that might be reason enough to continue our public set form of prayer. For if the service have not fault in it, but that 'tis 'enjoined:' and if the enjoining of a good service of God Almighty, in which Christian people may consent, and unanimously and uniformly worship Him, be no fault at all, as most certain it is not: 'tis neither wisdom nor safety to cast off such a 'custom or usage' and leave every minister (and perhaps other men too) to make what prayers they please in the congregation, which doubtless would be many times such, as no good understanding Christian could say Amen to.

sides, with my Lord's leave, upon the 'consideration' ı he desires me to take, I think I have found 'other ences.' For, besides 'the use and custom which we ıured to,' I find, that to have some set form of prayer, the congregation meets, is little less than *traditio rsalis*, an universal tradition of the whole Church[o].

is universal for time. For it is d by Dionysius the Areopagite, se works be his,) De Ecclesia . p. 77. edit. Gr. Lat., and he e of the contemporaries of the es, that there were then set f prayer, to which all the people men. [Εὐχὴν ἱερὰν ποιεῖται, καὶ ἀπάσης αὐτῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας συμ-ράσης ('dicendo Amen' is added vers.).—Dion. Areop. de Eccl.). 77. Lut. Par. 1615.] And if ius were not the author, yet the s exceeding ancient. And so ıet forms continued, till after ustin's time, as appears by Justyr, Apol. ii. p. 97. edit. Gr. Lat. isti 150. [Κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόπέρ τε αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέν-ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάντων εὐτόνως. ıst. Mart. Apol. i. (al. ii.) § 65.] tull. Apologet. c. 39. an. Christi "Coimus ad Deum, quasi manu recationibus ambiamus. Hæc) grata est. Oramus etiam pro toribus, pro ministris eorum ac tibus, pro statu sæculi, pro quiete, pro mora. finis."—Tert. cap. xxix. Op., p. 31. A.] By rian, De Orat. Domin. ["Pub-t nobis et communis oratio, et) oramus, non pro uno sed pro ɔpulo oramus, quia totus ponum sumus."—S. Cypr. de Orat. Op., p. 206.] By Origen, Hom. um. an. Christi 230. ["Sed et istiæ sive percipiendæ, sive eo o geritur explicandæ, vel eorum runtur in baptismo, verborum, ımque et ordinum, atque internum ac responsionum, quis explicet rationem."— Orig. in cap. iv. Hom. v. vers. Ruffini. m. ii. pp. 284. col. 2. F., 285. A.] By the Council of Laocan. xviii. xix. an. Christi 316. ·οῦ τὴν αὐτὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν πάντοτε καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐννάταις, καὶ ἑσπέραις ὀφείλειν γίνεσθαι. — Laod. can. xviii. Conc., tom. i.)0. B: Περὶ τοῦ δεῖν ἰδίᾳ πρῶτον ıs ὁμιλίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ τῶν κατηχουμένων εὐχὴν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, κ.τ.λ. —Can. xix. ibid. C.] By St. Basil, Epist. ad Clericos Neocæsariensis Ecclesiæ. [Πρὸς δὲ τὸ ἐπὶ ταῖς ψαλμῳδίαις ἔγκλημα, ᾧ μάλιστα τοὺς ἁπλουστέρους φοβοῦσιν οἱ διαβάλλοντες ἡμᾶς, ἐκεῖνο εἰπεῖν ἔχω· ὅτι τὰ νῦν κεκρατηκότα ἔθη πάσαις ταῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις συνῳδά ἐστι καὶ σύμφωνα. Ἐκ νυκτὸς γὰρ ὀρθρίζει παρ' ἡμῖν ὁ λαὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τῆς προσευχῆς . . . ἔπειτα . . . ἡμέρας ἤδη ὑπολαμπούσης, πάντες κοινῇ, ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος καὶ μιᾶς καρδίας, τὸν τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως ψαλμὸν ἀναφέρουσι τῷ Κυρίῳ.—S. Bas. Ep. ccvii. (al. lxiii.) ad Neoc. § 3. Op., tom. iii. p. 311. A. B. C.] By St. Chrysostom . . . [Bingham has devoted a whole chapter of his Antiquities (book xiii. chap. vi.) to prove not merely that set forms of prayer were used in the time of S. Chrysostom, but also to show what were the details of the public service.] . . . both about the same year. As also by St. Cyril of Jerusalem. [See S. Cyril's third Catech. Lecture, passim.] . . . . By the third Council of Carthage, can. xxiii. an. Christi 397. ["Quicunque sibi preces aliunde describit, non eis utatur, nisi prius eas cum instructioribus fratribus contulerit."—Conc. Carth. III. can. xxiii.—Conc., tom. ii. col. 1170. D. E.] By St. Aug. Ep. lix. et clvi. and De Dono Perseverantiæ, c. 13. an. Christi 400. ["Sed eligo in his verbis hoc intelligere, quod omnis vel pene omnis frequentat Ecclesia, ut 'precationes' accipiamus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, etc." — S. Aug. Epist. cxlix. (al. lix.) § 16. Op., tom. ii. col. 761. B. "Ut anima Christiana non frustra audiat 'Sursum cor;' nec frustra respondeat se, 'Habere ad Dominum.'"—Epist. cxxxi. (al. clvi.) Ibid. col. 589. C. "Quod ergo in sacramentis fidelium dicitur, ut 'Sursum cor habeamus ad Dominum,' munus est Domini; de quo munere ipsi Domino Deo nostro gratias agere, a sacerdote, post hanc vocem quibus hoc dicitur, admonentur; et 'Dignum

And that it took beginning while some of the Apostles were yet living, and hath continued from thence in all ages and places of the Church to this day. Now, though particular customs and traditions vary and may be varied in several Churches; yet I do not find there is such a power over traditions that are general; but that next to the Scripture itself, they are kept by all sober Christians inviolable. And St. Au-

ac justum esse' respondent."—S. Aug. de Dono Persev. cap. xiii. (§ 33.) Op., tom. x. col. 1417. C. D.] By the second Milevitan Council, can. xii. [See above, p. 97.] And by Prosper Aquitan. lib. i. De Vocat. Gent. c. 4; ["Quam legem supplicationis ita omnium sacerdotum et omnium fidelium devotio concorditer tenet, ut nulla pars mundi sit, in qua hujusmodi orationes non celebrentur a populis Christianis."—Prosp. Aquit. de Voc. Gent. lib. i. cap. 4. fol. 92. a. Basil. 1524. Prosper is commenting on the passage 1 Tim. ii. 2.] since which time no question can be made, but the public prayers were always in a known and set form.

And that it was universal for place, appears by the concurrent testimonies of the Fathers before recited, and the Councils, and the practice, both of the Asian, African, and European Churches. As Justin Martyr, Basil, and Chrysostom, for the Greek; and Tertullian, Cyprian, St. Augustin, and Prosper, testify for the West. Insomuch, that St. Basil says expressly in that place, "that for the order of singing the Psalms in their public service, it was agreeable to all the Churches of God:" [see above:] which place is also cited by Whitaker at Ration. 6. Campiani. [Op., tom. i. p. 28. col. 1. Genev. 1610.] And divers particulars in their set form of prayer, remain to this day in the Liturgy of the Church of England. As that there should be recited a General Confession of the Faith. Dionysius Areopag. de Ecclesia Hierar. p. 88. edit. Gr. Lat. [Προομολογηθείσης ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πληρώματος τῆς καθολικῆς ὑμνολογίας. The Latin version is, "Cum antea universus fidelium cœtus generalem fidei confessionem pronunciaret.' — Dion. Areop. de Ecc. Hier. p. 88.] That prayers were made for emperors and men in authority; and for the peace and quiet of the world. So Tertullian. [See above.] That the presbyter should exhort them 'to lift up their hearts;' and the people answer, 'We lift them up unto the Lord.' So St. Cyprian ["Ideo et sacerdos ante orationem præfatione præmissa præparat fratrum mentes dicendo, 'Sursum corda; ut dum respondet plebs, 'Habemus ad Dominum,' admoneatur nihil aliud se quam Dominum cogitare debere."—S. Cypr. de Orat. Domin. Op., p. 213.] and St. Augustin. [See above.] The interrogations and answers in Baptism. So Origen. [See above.] That prayers should be made, not only for the faithful, but for infidels and enemies to the cross of Christ. So Prosper. ["Supplicat ergo ubique Ecclesia Deo non solum pro sanctis et in Christo jam regeneratis, sed etiam pro omnibus infidelibus, et inimicis crucis Christi."—Prosper, as above.] And 'tis preserved in our Collect for Good Friday. And the people's praying with, and answering the pastor, saying, 'Lord, have mercy upon us,' with, 'Christ, have mercy upon us,' was before St. Gregory's time, and continued down to ours, yet with difference from the Mass-book too. As Dr. Rainolds proves, Conf. with Hart. c. 8. divi. 4. p. 581. [Lond. 1598.]

But howsoever, set forms they were, and such as in some particulars, *fere omnis Ecclesia Dominica*, almost all the Church of Christ used. So St. Augustin. [See above.] And there is *nulla pars mundi*, scarce any part of the world, in which there is not a concordant, an agreement in these prayers: so Prosper. [See above.] Which is impossible to be but by a set form. And so the Magdeburgians conclude upon due examination: *Formulas denique precationum absque dubio habuerunt:* "Out of all doubt the ancients had set forms of prayer."— Cent. 3. c. 6. [p. 135. Basil. 1560.]

gustine says plainly, ''tis *insolentissimæ insaniæ,* a trick of most insolent madness, to dispute or doubt of that, *quod tota per orbem frequentat Ecclesia,* which the Church of Christ practises throughout the whole world [p].' And for my part I believe him; and I would my Lord did so too, and then I think he would not refuse 'the service for the injunction,' nor fall into any fit of this 'insolent madness.' As for 'preaching,' that was ever left free. And therefore the Church did ever put a difference.

14 And I find, upon this 'consideration,' another difference yet, between 'prayer and preaching.' For preaching is a speech to man for his edification and instruction in faith and good life. But prayer is a speech to God, to honour and worship Him, in the acknowledgment of His dominion over, and His bounty and goodness towards all creatures, but mankind especially. And therefore, though a man cannot take too much pains in that which he is to speak from God to man, lest he be proved a false relater; yet of the two, there should be more care had, what prayers he puts up for himself and the whole congregation, unto God; lest he be not only a false worshipper, but also, lest he suddenly and unadvisedly ask that, which may be hurtful unto all. And for aught he knows, God may at that time be angry with us for our sins, and may hear in His anger, and grant. And I believe it will be found a greater and more dangerous sin for the priest to make the people ask at God's hands those things 'which they ought not.' Besides, the public prayers of the Church do teach and inform the people, not only how to pray, and so how to worship, but in many things also, what to believe, as well, nay, oftentimes better, than many sermons. So that ill praying in public contains almost all the mischiefs that ill preaching hath in it, over and above all the ill that is proper to itself: and so is the more dangerous sin: and therefore the Church cannot be too careful for a set and known form for public prayer; yea, and that enjoined too, so it be well weighed beforehand; though for preaching she leave a greater latitude. So upon consideration, I think there is more difference between a set form of

[p] St. Aug. Epist. cxviii. [(al. liv.)] c. v. [Op., tom. ii. col. 188. D.]

[illegible]

[illegible] that we are invited [illegible] when I hear what [illegible] nowadays, [illegible] like injunc- [illegible] that such loose, [illegible] as are in many [illegible] now done [illegible] charge against [illegible] his Lord- [illegible] common-prayer.

[illegible]

[illegible] *so far further,* [illegible] *imputation laid* [illegible] *the greatest in*

[illegible] his Lordship patience [illegible] and so [illegible] what language, [illegible] his Lordship, [illegible] add no more, [illegible] expressed what he [illegible]

[illegible] *as that* [illegible] *a little manu-* [illegible] *where it may be* [illegible] *certainly a* [illegible] *it is no* 495 [illegible] *the potent* [illegible] *those who* [illegible] *dictates,* [illegible] *them to any* [illegible] *And* [illegible] *in ancient times,* [illegible]

[illegible] Separatist:' and [illegible] Mr. Hales saith.'

[illegible] published anonymously in [illegible]

And surely the first part of Mr. Hales is very true, that where this word, or the crime signified by it, 'is rightly fixed and deservedly charged, 'tis a great offence.' But that which follows, by my Lord's good leave, and Mr. Hales his too, is somewhat too hard a censure upon the times, and the persons living in them. The truth is, some men are too apt to accuse others of schism and separation; but yet I do not think the disease is so epidemical, as 'tis here expressed. As namely, that it is 'in common use amongst us.' Perhaps, nothing so common at this time to call Separatist as to be one. Or that it is a 'theological scarecrow, by which the potent and prevalent party uses to affright and enforce those who are not of their opinions, to subscribe to their dictates.' Or sure, if there be such practice, the fault is in the persons that use it. But even that is no excuse at all for schism or separation; because some, in an inconsiderate heat, charge that crime upon such as are not guilty. For perhaps my Lord may say as much as this of excommunication itself, that some are struck with it who deserve it not; and yet, I hope, my Lord hath not proceeded so far, as to say that excommunication is but 'a theological scarecrow.'

And I further think, there are as few at this day of them whom my Lord calls 'the potent and prevalent party, which refuse to be brought to any rule of examination, either of Scripture or reason,' as have lived in this Church for some hundreds of years past, how meanly soever this Lord esteems them, and how 'narrow' soever he thinks their 'comprehensions' are.

To conclude this passage; my Lord tells us 'that Mr. Hales observes further, that this was too usual, even in ancient times, as well as now.' That some faults, and some degrees of this fault, were in ancient times, as well as now, may be true enough; and yet in those ancient times none thought 'schism or separation from the Church,' howsoever charged, to be but 'a theological scarecrow;' but caused it to be examined to the bottom, as 'tis fit, nay necessary, that it should: for else the most dangerous separation that can be may go away free with this: that it is but 'a trick of the prevalent party, to fright other men into their opinions, by charging them with separation.' Now, the most dangerous separation in a

Church is, where the Church itself hath little or no power to punish separatists; and where they of the separation are, by the great misfortune of the State, become the potent and prevalent party. And whether this be not, or at least were not, the condition of the State and Church of England, when my Lord printed this speech of his, I leave to the indifferent reader to judge.

My Lord hath printed no more than this, and therefore 49
I will take notice of no more. But yet I am told by a very good hand, that his Lordship upon this quotation of Mr. Hales his manuscript was pleased openly in that honourable House of Parliament, where he spake it, to lend Mr. Hales one wipe, and me another. But since my Lord is pleased to pass it over at the press, I shall do so too. Yet with this, that if my Lord did give that gird, I will make it plainly appear, whenever he shall publish it, that there is no show of truth in it. But now that my Lord hath done with Mr. Hales, he proceeds, and tells us his own judgment:—

> *Secondly, I say that there is a twofold separation; one from the Universal or Catholic Church, which can no otherwise be made but by denying the faith (for faith and love are the requisites to that communion).*

And I say so too, that there is a twofold separation; and that one of them is from the 'Universal or Catholic Church.' But that this 'separation can no otherwise be made, but by denying the faith,' I doubt comes short of truth. First, because there is a great difference between schism and apostasy. And every apostasy is a separation; but every separation is not apostasy. For a man is not an apostate properly, till he fall away, by denying the whole faith. But a man may be in heresy, schism, and separation upon the denial of any one article of the faith, received by the Catholic Church. Secondly, because, should a man agree in all and every article of the faith with the Catholic Church, yet he may maintain some false opinion, and incongruous, both to the verity and the practice of religion, and judgment of the Universal Church, and be so in love with these, as that for these opinions' sake he will separate from the whole body.

Therefore denial of the faith is not the only cause of sepa-

ration from the Catholic Church, since this separation can be otherwise made. And my Lord, within the space of three lines, crosses himself. For first, he says, 'that this separation can no otherwise be made, but by denying the faith.' And in the very next words he tells us, 'that faith and love are the requisites to that communion.' Two requisites to that communion with the Universal Church; therefore two causes of separation from it. Therefore, by my Lord's own confession, he that is so out of charity with the Universal Church, for some opinions or practices which he dislikes, as that he will not communicate with it, is in separation, though he do not deny the faith.

> *The other* (my Lord tells us) *is a separation from this or that particular church or congregation. And that not in respect of difference with them in matter of faith or love, but in dislike only of such corruptions, in their external worship and Liturgies, as they do admit of, and would enjoin upon others.*

In this other particular separation, I shall meddle with neither congregation nor conventicle, meeting allowed or disallowed by Church or State; but that separation which is or is not made by my Lord and his followers, from the National Church of England, as it stands settled and established by law: not as her service may be mangled, or otherwise abused, in any particular parish or congregation whatsoever. And if this Lord dislike any the service as 'tis used in some one parish or other, and yet will come to the service as it is established by law in other, either cathedral or parochial churches, my Lord hath had great wrong to be accounted a Separatist. But if my Lord will not come to the prayers of the Church of England by law established, let his pretence be what it will, a Separatist he is.

But my Lord says, 'that this particular separation is not in respect of difference with them in matter of faith or love.'

1. Where first you may observe on the by, that in my Lord's judgment, public breach in charity, as well as in faith, may be cause of this separation, too, as well as of that from 'the Universal or Catholic Church,' before mentioned.

2. Next, that this particular separation, if it be not 'in

respect of difference in faith or love,' in what respect is it then? Why, if we may herein believe my Lord, 'tis only in dislike 'of such corruptions in their external worship and Liturgies as they do admit of, and would enjoin others.' Well, first, I'll pray for my Lord, that there be no difference in faith and charity; but I do very much doubt there is. Next, either there are such corruptions in 'the external worship and Liturgies,' as his Lordship hath just cause to dislike, or there are not. If there be not, why doth he separate from them? If there be, or probably seem to be, why doth he not complain to the King and the Church, that these corruptions may be considered on, and amended, if cause appear?

And this he ought to do before he separate. For I hope Christianity is not yet come to that pass, (though it draw on apace,) that a powerful layman or two shall say there are corruptions in the set service of God, and then be judges of such corruptions themselves. Nor doth the Church of England 'admit of corruptions' in her Liturgy, or 'labour to enjoin them upon others.' Now, my Lord tells us further, that—

> *This is a separation, not from their persons, as they are Christians, but from their corruptions in matter of worship, as they are therewith defiled. And this separation every man that will keep himself pure from other men's sins, and not sin against his own conscience, must make.*

This will not yet help my Lord; for say 'this be not a separation from their persons, as they are Christians,' which yet it too often proves to be, and I believe, if this Lord would impartially examine himself, he would find to be true in himself and his comportment, but that it is 'from their corruptions in matter of worship, as they are therewith defiled.' 1. First, these corruptions are not proved; so 'tis *petitio principii*, the begging of that to be granted, which is the thing in question. 2. Secondly, if there be corruptions, yet it is not proved they are in the 'matter,' but of the two, rather in the manner of worship. 3. Thirdly, were both these granted, yet it will remain a question still, whether these corruptions be 49
such as 'that the worshippers are defiled therewith?' And another question, whether so deeply defiled, as that other

good Christians shall be defiled by coming to common-prayer with them? For I am not yet persuaded, nor shall be, till I be convinced, 'that every man that will keep himself pure from other men's sins, and not sin against his conscience, is bound to make this separation.' For I conceive, many corruptions may be tolerated, nay, ought to be, before a separation be made. And that a private conscience is to be both informed and reformed, before it be attempted.

Nor can I think that he which comes to the public service of any Church that is not idolatrous, or peccant in the fundamentals of religion, doth partake with other men's sins, that frequent the same common-prayer or service with him, or he with them.

And yet my Lord is so peremptory, as that without any distinction or degrees of corruption, he delivers it positively, with a great deal more boldness than knowledge, 'that every man that will keep himself pure from other men's sins, must make this separation.' 'Every man,' and 'must make.' And it is not to be conceived, but that what every man must do, my Lord, who seems to be so careful to keep himself pure from other men's sins, hath done already. That is, hath made this separation from the Church. And my Lord, for aught I see, is ready to confess as much. For he adds:—

> *And I will ingenuously confess, that there are many things, in many churches or congregations in England, practised, and enjoined upon all to be practised and suffered, which I cannot practise nor admit of, except I should sin against the light of my conscience, until I may out of the Word of God be convinced of the lawfulness of them; which hitherto I could never see sufficient ground for.*

I told you my Lord was very near confessing as much as I have said. For he says, 'ingenuously, there are many things in many churches in England practised.'

First, I told my Lord before, that this business of separation was not to be judged by what is practised in one or more parochial congregations, but by what ought to be practised in all the churches of England. And if my Lord dislike anything in one congregation, he may go to another, (so he will endure the whole Liturgy, as it is settled by law,) and no

man, if he will do this, ought to account him a Separatist. And I find by my Lord's words, that his exception is to 'many churches;' and I would willingly hope (if his carriage would let me) that he excepts not against all. Besides, he tells us that 'many things' are so practised; but he is not pleased to tell us what they are. And then it is not possible for me or any man else either to know whether his Lordship's exception be just against them, or to give him satisfaction in them. And it is no great sign that my Lord bears any good mind to the Church, that he is so ready to charge 'many things' against the Church, and to name none.

My Lord goes further, and says plainly, 'that there [are] many things thus practised, or enjoined also, and that upon all, to be practised or suffered, which he cannot practise nor admit of, except he should sin against the light of his conscience.' 49 You have heard already, how much my Lord is troubled with this 'enjoining,' and to that I refer you: in the meantime, since I am the man so particularly shot at by my Lord, I shall answer for myself according to truth; and with truth I can legally prove, if need be, I have not commanded or enjoined any one thing, ceremonial or other, upon any parochial congregation in England, much less upon all, to be either practised or suffered, but that which is directly commanded by law. And if any inferior ordinary in the kingdom, or any of my own officers, have given any such command, 'tis either without my knowledge, or against my direction. And 'tis well known, I have sharply chid some for this very particular; and if my Lord would have acquainted me with any such troubled thought of his, I would have given him (so far as had been in my power) either satisfaction or remedy, if anything had been 'against the light of his conscience.' Though in these things I must needs tell my Lord, that there is nowadays, in many men which have shaken off all Church obedience, great pretensions to light in their understandings and consciences, when to men which see indeed, 'tis little less than palpable darkness. But how it is with my Lord and his conscience, I will not take upon me to judge; but leave him to stand or fall to his own Master[r]. Rom. xiv.

For it seems, my Lord stands not simply upon the light of

[r] Rom. xiv. 4.

his conscience, 'but only until he may be convinced out of the Word of God of the lawfulness of these things, which hitherto he could never see sufficient ground for.' And this is the common plea which all of them have resort to, till they be convinced, which (as I have had experience of many) they are resolved not to be. And they will be convinced in every particular, 'out of the Word of God, to the very taking up of a rush or straw,' as their grave master, T. C.[s], taught them. As if God took care of straws, or their taking of them up: as if every particular thing of order or decency were expressly set down in the Word of God. Surely, if this were so, St. Paul should have had nothing 'to set in order when he came to Corinth[t],' 1 Cor. xi. And if this be so, the Church hath no power left in anything, not so much as to command a bell shall toll to call the people to public prayers, because 'tis nowhere commanded in the Word of God. So that upon this ground, if any man shall say 'he hath light enough in his conscience' to see the unlawfulness of such human devices, he may separate from the Church, rather than sin against this light. So there shall be no public service of God, but some *ignis fatuus* or other, under the name of 'light in the conscience,' shall except against it, and separate from it; which is directly to set up the light in each private spirit against that light which God hath placed in His Church, shine it never so clearly. Yet his Lordship is confident, and says:—

> *But, my Lords, this is so far from making me the greatest Separatist in England, that it cannot argue me to be any at all. For my Lords the Bishops do know, that those whom they usually apply this term unto are the Brownists (as they call them by another name), and they know their tenents. The truth is, they differ with us in no fundamental point of doctrine, or saving truth, I know.*

Here then my Lord is pleased to say, that all that he hath hitherto said, 'is so far from making him the greatest Separatist in England, that it cannot argue him to be any at all.'

[s] T. C. l[ib]. s[ec]. pp. 59, 60, apud Hook. [Eccl. Pol.] lib. ii. s. 1. p. 54. [p. 361, Keble's ed. Oxf. 1839.]

[t] 1 Cor. xi. 34.

For my part, I would to God it were so; but let's examine whether it be so or not. First, then, this I humbly conceive is certain, that he, whoever he be, that will not communicate in public prayers with a national Church, which serves God as she ought, is a Separatist. But the Church of England, as it stands established by law, serves God as she ought: therefore my Lord, by his general absenting himself from her communion in prayers, is a Separatist. And this is by his own confession; for he says a little before, and that expressly, that 'this is a separation which every man must make, that will keep himself pure from other men's sins.' And I cannot doubt, but his Lordship hath made that, which he says he must make.

All that can be said for my Lord herein is this; first, that my Lord charges the Church of England with 'corruptions in the worship of God; and such corruptions, as he must separate from her.' But is it sufficient for a separation, for a particular man barely to say there are such corruptions in the Liturgy, when he doth neither prove them to be such, nor so much as name them what they are? Surely no. And I think these gnats (which his Lordship strains at) may be swallowed without any offence to God or man: so far are they from being 'a just cause of separation.' Therefore, for all this, my Lord is a Separatist.

Yea, but my Lord charges upon the Church of England, that 'she enjoins her Liturgy upon all men, by a certain number of men usurping authority to themselves, and imposing this injunction under the name of the Church.' I have made answer already to this power of the Church to compose a set form for public service; and, I hope, made it manifest, that this authority is not usurped. And then, that can be no just cause of a separation. Nay, I must doubt whether, if such authority were usurped by some Churchmen in any national Church, the enjoining of the service after it is made, supposing always that it contain no idolatry or fundamental error, be for the injunction alone a sufficient warrant to my Lord or any other to separate. Therefore, my Lord's forsaking the public service of the Church, upon no better grounds than these, makes him a Separatist by his own confession, without any man calling him so.

As for his Lordship's being 'the greatest Separatist in England,' I have at the beginning of this tract clearly related, to the uttermost of my memory, what and upon what occasion I spake of his Lordship in this kind. But whether I said it or not, my Lord, for aught I see, will hardly escape being so. For he is the greatest Separatist from the Church, that absents himself with most will and least cause: and this, if I mistake not, is my Lord's case; for he separates with most will that says, 'men must and ought to separate;' and upon least cause, because as yet he hath named none at all; but corruptions in general, which any man may say; and 'the injunction of a set form,' which is no cause. Therefore, (for aught I yet see,) it may truly be said of his Lordship, that he is 'the greatest Separatist in England.'

Especially if you add to this, how busy and active his Lordship is, and for many years hath been, to promote this cause of separation. And I have some very good grounds to think, that his Lordship hath been and is the great cause and enlarger of all the separation that now is in Church affairs; and of all the disobedience thereby bred or cherished against sovereign power.

Next, my Lord appeals to my Lords the Bishops; and tells them 'that they know that they whom they usually apply this name (Separatist) unto, are the Brownists, as they call them by another name.' I know not all things which the rest of my learned brethren the Bishops know; yet, I think, both they and I know this, that the name Separatist is a common name to all heretics or schismatics, that separate for their opinions' sakes either from the Catholic, or from any particular orthodox Church. And if my Lord himself (who, it seems, is well acquainted with them), or any of my Lords the Bishops do know that this name is usually applied to the Brownists, be it so. That, I am sure, is not material, unless it be for that which my Lord closes this passage withal.

Namely, that 'my Lords the Bishops know the tenents of the Brownists; and that the truth is, they differ from us in no fundamental point of doctrine or saving truth, that his Lordship knows.' I doubt not but my Lords the Bishops know the tenents of the Brownists, so far forth at least as they be tenents, and not varied from; and so far as they are their

[illegible] to which all or most of them agree; and so [illegible] plain and univocal tenents, and not such as [illegible] with the very faith itself. But such tenents [illegible] as these are, it may be, all my Lords the [illegible]

[illegible] be, as my Lord says it is, 'for aught he [illegible] the Brownists differ from us in no fundamental [illegible] saving truth;' then, out of all doubt, [illegible]—their sin and my Lord's too) is the [illegible] will so uncharitably, and with so great [illegible] and to the great scandal of religion, [illegible] themselves from, and now labour utterly to [illegible] which by my Lord's own confession [illegible] from them 'in any fundamental point of [illegible] saving truth.' For sure, if they differ not from [illegible] from them. But this is only *argumentum* [illegible] sufficient to convince this Lord, I think, [illegible]

[illegible] the truth is quite another thing; namely, [illegible] of England is very orthodox, and that the [illegible] call them as you will, do separate [illegible] and that, besides mat- [illegible] and breach of charity, they do differ from us [illegible] points of doctrine and saving truth.'

[illegible] tells us of 'corruptions in the [illegible] Church, but names none; and should I [illegible] Brownists with difference from the Church in [illegible] doctrine, and yet name none, I should [illegible] fault for which I there taxed my Lord. [illegible] some instances of some of their opi- [illegible] the indifferent reader to judge, whether [illegible] from us in some fundamental points of 50 [illegible] and then, consequently, whether [illegible] as well as a schismatical separation, [illegible] from the Church of England.

[illegible] was a creed printed by John Turner, [illegible] and the Parliament sitting. This Turner [illegible] Brownist, if you will[1]. In this

[illegible] his Province for 1637, Works, vol. v. pp. [illegible]

creed of his, he leaves out 'the descent of Christ into hell.' This is an article of the Apostles' Creed; and 'tis an article of the Church of England; and so, I presume, a 'fundamental point of doctrine.' Yet herein this Brownist and his fellows differ from us. And I have heard from some present, that at a committee of Lords, appointed for matters of religion, a young Lord[y] should say, openly and boldly enough, that he did not believe 'the descent of Christ into hell:' and that my Lord, the author of this speech, should second him.

2. In the same creed, Turner professes he believes 'that Christ instituted by His Apostles certain particular Churches here on earth, and no other.' So the Catholic Church, the mother of all particular both men and Churches, and out of which there can be no salvation in the ordinary way, is quite thrust out of this Brownist's creed. And this, I hope, is another 'fundamental point of doctrine and saving truth.' But in this I must do my Lord right, and not charge him with this point; because a little before, his Lordship tells of 'a twofold separation, one whereof,' he says, 'is from the Universal, or Catholic Church.' So the Catholic Church is not yet thrust out of my Lord's creed. But then this appears, that the Separatists are not yet agreed upon all the articles of their creed. Nay, some of them call the Apostles' Creed 'a patched forgery;' and Barrow justifies it[z].

3. Thirdly, they differ from us in charging 'gross corruptions' upon the Church of England. And these are known to my Lord, for he acknowledges them; and so gross, that, should they be true, the Church of England must be faulty 'in fundamental and saving truth:' as shall further appear in my answer to my Lord's next passage[a]. Therefore, if their charge be true, they must, by my Lord's own confession, differ from us 'in fundamental and saving truth.' And if their charge be false, why do they separate from us? Besides, all Anabaptists and Brownists agree in this, that the Church of England is antichristian. And if it be so, they must either differ in fundamentals from the

[y] The Lord Brook.
[z] Barrow's Reply to Gifford, p. 255. [Lond. 1606.]
[a] P. 48.

Church of England, or be antichristian themselves in joining with them, or grant that Christ and Antichrist have one and the same foundation.

4. Fourthly, some of them yet living, though they dare not speak it out in all companies, do cunningly insinuate 'that at death, soul and body are extinct together, but shall rise again at the resurrection, first or last. And that Christ shall come and live here upon the earth again. That the martyrs shall then rise, and live with Him a thousand years; and that Christ, once come upon the earth, shall not (for anything they can learn out of Scripture) ever depart from the earth again.'

5. Fifthly, one Brierly and his Independent congregation are of this belief, 'that the child of God, in the power of grace, doth perform every duty so well, that to ask pardon 503
for failing, either in matter or manner, is a sin. That it is unlawful to pray for forgiveness of sins, after their conversion.' With divers others, some as bad, some worse, to the number of fifty[b].

6. Sixthly, one Spisberrye yet living, and of that Independent fraternity, maintains that 'God works all things in us, and that we are but organs, instruments, and mere empty trunks.' Which is to make God the author of all the sins which men commit. And therefore Brierly says expressly[c], 'that if they do at any time fall, they can by the power of grace carry their sin to the Lord, and say, Here I had it, and here I leave it.' Will not the devil one day stop the mouth of this blasphemy?

7. Seventhly, Mr. Pryn himself (who hath been a great stickler in these troubles of the Church) says expressly, 'Let any true saint of God be taken away in the very act of any known sin, before it is possible for him to repent; I make no doubt or scruple of it, but he shall as surely be saved as if he had lived to have repented of it[d].' And he instances in David, 'in case he had been taken away before he had repented of his adultery and murder.' So, according to this divinity, the true saints of God may commit horrible and

[b] The 50 Propositions taken from his own mouth.

[c] Propositions xix.

[d] Pryn in his Perpetuity, p. 431. [Lond. 1627.]

crying sins, die without repentance, and yet be sure of salvation; which teareth up the very foundations of religion, induceth all manner of profaneness into the world, and is expressly contrary to the whole current of the Scripture[e].

8. In the eighth place, almost all of them say that God from all eternity reprobates by far the greater part of mankind to eternal fire, without any eye at all to their sin. Which opinion my very soul abominates. For it makes God, the God of all mercies, to be the most fierce and unreasonable tyrant in the world. For the question is not here, what God may do by an absolute act of power, would He so use it upon the creature which He made of nothing: but what He hath done, and what stands with His wisdom, justice, and goodness to do.

9. Ninthly, one Lionel Lockier, now or late of Cranbrooke, in Kent, among other his errors, rails against 'teaching children the Lord's Prayer, or other forms of catechising.' And if they differ from the Church of England in the whole Catechism, I think the Lord must work a miracle before he can make his speech good, that they 'differ from us in no fundamental point.'

10. Lastly, to omit all those base opinions in which the Brownists agree with the Anabaptists; this, in which they differ from them, will be sufficient to prove that they differ from us in that which is fundamental; unless they will say, that to believe the Trinity is not fundamental. For some of them, and by name one Glover[f], deny the Deity of the Holy Ghost. Which stands condemned for a gross and fundamental heresy in the second General Council[g], held against Macedonius. And for the Familists[h] (of which there is store this day in England), they deny the resurrection of the flesh, turning it, as they do many other things, into a mystery or allegory. Perhaps more particulars might be found upon

[e] Ezech. xviii. 26; Prov. xxviii. 13; S. Luc. xiii. 3; S. Luc. xxi. 24; Acts iii. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 9; Gal. v. 10; and many other places.

[f] Rog. in Symb. Art. vii. Prop. 5. [Glover is here said, not to deny the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, but the obligation of the moral law. Rogers on 'the Faith, Doctrine, &c. professed in the Church of England,' p. 39. Lond. 1633. In p. 24 he mentions the error of H. N., who held that the Holy Ghost was merely "the inheritance allotted to the faithful, and the being or virtuous estate of Christ."]

[g] Concil. Const. I. [Can. i.—Conc. tom. ii. col. 946. E.]

[h] Hooker's Pref. to Eccl. Pol. s. iii. [§ 9, p. 184; where see also Mr. Keble's valuable note, giving some further details of their opinions.]

a narrow search. But if there be no more, these are enough to make it evident to the world that these Separatists 'differ from us in some fundamental points of doctrine, or saving 504
truth. And as these are in fault for their separation, so I doubt the Church is to blame, for not proceeding against such of them as are altogether incorrigible.

But whether my Lord thinks these to be fundamental points, or whether he knew that the Brownists do differ from us in them, I shall not take on me to declare, till his Lordship open himself further. In the meantime his Lordship goes on to tell us wherein these Brownists fail, though they do not differ in fundamental points to his knowledge:—

Their failing is in this. They hold that there is no true Church in England, no true ministry, no true worship, (which depend one upon the other:) they say all is antichristian. Here is their error: they distinguish not between the bene esse, *or purity of a true Church, and the* esse, *or true being of it, though with many defects and gross corruptions: but conclude, because such things are wanting which are, indeed, necessary to the well-being of a true Church, and to be desired, therefore there is none at all in being.*

Here my Lord shows a great deal of sharp and good apprehension, and distinguishes very rightly between the entire being of a true Church, which is her *bene esse*, and the true being of a Church, which is her *esse* only. And my Lord doth further fairly acknowledge, that this is the Brownists' error, to conclude no Church in being, because it hath many defects and gross corruptions in it to hinder its well-being.

So then, my Lord here grants two things:

First, that 'no hold there is no true Church in England, no true ministry, no true worship, (which depend one upon another,) but that all is Antichristian,' is an error.

And, secondly, that it is the Brownists' error. How, and how do these three, no true Church, no true ministry, no true worship, depend one upon another: and in what cases it may in some exigents be otherways, I will not now dispute, nor divert from the main business.

I first, then, if it be an error to say, there is no true

Church, no true ministry, no true worship in England; then, I hope, it will be found truth to say, there is a true Church, a true ministry, and a true worship in England. And he that shall avow the contrary, must needs differ from the Church of England in fundamentals. For these contradictions; a true Church, and no true Church; a true ministry, and no true ministry; a true worship of God, and no true worship; cannot be built up but upon different foundations. And as for that which my Lord affirms is added by the Brownists, that there are many defects and gross corruptions in it: so long as this is said, and not proved, 'tis enough, without further proof, to deny both the defects and corruptions, both the many and the gross. As I doubt not but the Church of England can make good, against both my Lord and all the Brownists in England.

2. Secondly, if to affirm this be the Brownists' error, then I would fain know of my Lord how he can say 'the Brownists do not differ from or with us in any fundamental point of doctrine or saving truth?' For if this be no 'fundamental point,' or no 'saving truth,' that we be in and of a true Church; that this Church hath a true ministry, to be between God and us in all the duties of their function; whether upward to God in prayer and spiritual sacrifice, or downward to us in the word and sacraments; that in this Church, and by this ministry, there is a true worship, and that without gross corruptions: what can be accounted, next the Creed itself, fundamental or saving? So that in one line my Lord is pleased to say, 'the Brownists do not differ with us in any fundamental point of doctrine, or saving truth;' and in the very next line his Lordship confesses they differ from us in these three things, which if not several, yet altogether, as they depend one upon another, are saving and fundamental.

Nor can this cautelous close help my Lord one jot, that he adds, 'The Brownists do not differ from us in any fundamental point of doctrine or saving truth, as his Lordship knows.' For were his Lordship of a 'shallow or narrow comprehension,' 'twere another matter: but since he is so full of understanding in these things, 'tis impossible but he must know these three together are fundamental; and being so, he must needs know also, that 'the Brownists differ with us in

fundamentals;' which is that which he denied. If, therefore, my Lord will say he knows not this to be the Brownists' error, why doth he take upon him to say it is? If he will grant that he knows it, he must needs know withal (if he will not shut out the light of his conscience, of which a little before he is so tender) that the Brownists, or Separatists, call them what you will, 'differ from us in some fundamental points of doctrine or saving truth.'

Thus far, then, my Lord relates the failing of the Brownist. I hope he will be so careful as not to fail with them himself. Yes, sure; for he adds:—

> *I hold no such opinion, but do believe to the contrary: that there are in England many true Churches, and a true ministry which I do hear, and with which Churches I could join in communion, were those yokes of bondage which are laid upon them taken off, and those corruptions removed, which they do (contrary, as I think, to their duty) yield unto and admit of: and this I am sure no Separatist in England holds, that deserves that name. And therefore I hope your Lordships will in that respect let me stand right in your opinions.*

Here my Lord tells us he holds 'no such opinion, but does believe to the contrary.' But I doubt, he so believes to the contrary, as that he is of the same opinion. For he believes 'that there are in England many true Churches, and a true ministry.' And so do all the Brownists; for no doubt but they believe, that all their congregations or conventicles are true Churches in England, and that the ministers which they hear are true ministers. And this is plainly my Lord's belief. For he saith he believes there is a true ministry in England, 'which he doth hear.' But what ministers they are 50
which he doth hear, he does not say.

Or if this be not my Lord's meaning, but that there are some true Churches and some true ministers in England, though ordained as in England they are; yet my Lord continues a Separatist still. For his Lordship doth not say, either that he doth, or that he will, or that he can join in communion with any of these Churches, or this ministry, which he says are true. But only that 'he could join with them if'—

If what? Why, 'if these yokes of bondage were taken off which are laid upon them, and those corruptions removed.' By the yokes of bondage he means the injunction of a set form of prayers, which he hath so often mentioned in this speech.

But what corruptions he means I know not, till his Lordship shall be pleased to tell us. Only this I conceive I may add; that all things are not corruptions in the Church, which my Lord calls so. That if these corruptions be fundamental, they may be such, too, as may keep these Churches which he speaks of from being true Churches, and the ministry from being a true ministry. But if these corruptions be of a very light allay, (as I verily believe they are, if there be any,) then his Lordship ought not to separate, but to join in communion with them, for all these, either 'yokes' or 'corruptions.' The Apostle, indeed, tells us of a Church without wrinkle[i], Ephes. v.: but that is a triumphant Church in heaven; not a militant upon earth. And for the yokes, which my Lord speaks of, they are not 'yokes of bondage,' as he pleases to call them; but yokes of obedience, which, whenever they shall be broken, the wild asses of the wilderness will overrun all[k].

My Lord goes further, and says, 'that in these true Churches this true ministry does yield unto and admit of these yokes and these corruptions, contrary, as he thinks, to their duty.' But it seems they think not so; or, if they do think so, why do they not remonstrate their grievance? Sure, if their conscience tell them they do against their duty, they ought to inform their conscience, or forbear the work. To inform their conscience I am sure is fit for them, if they need it. Though it seems my Lord would rather have them forbear the duty, the doing whereof he calls their yielding unto; and their admitting these things, which he calls 'yokes and corruptions.'

As for that which follows, and which my Lord says he is sure of, 'that no Separatist in England that deserves that name' holds that which his Lordship says here he doth believe, in that, also, I conceive his Lordship is utterly mistaken. For I believe there is no Separatist in England, Brownist or other, 'deserving that name,' but he holds and will say as much as my Lord believes, namely, that 'there are

[i] Ephes. v. 27. [k] Jer. ii. 24.

in England many true Churches,' that is, assemblies or congregations of their own brotherhood. 'And a true ministry:' to wit, those which themselves have made. And that they 'do hear them:' that is, such as these. Yea, and that they 'could join in communion with some other Churches, were those yokes of bondage which are laid upon them taken off, and those corruptions removed.' That is, upon the matter, if they would become as themselves are, then they would join with them. And this out of all doubt they think they ought to do, and neither 'yield unto such yokes, nor admit of such 50
corruptions.' So that my Lord may see every Separatist in England, even they which most deserve that name, hold that which his Lordship believes. And therefore no question can be made, but that my Lord deserves that name as much as any of them, even while he says, 'he is sure no Separatist in England that deserves that name holds as he doth.'

But to come to the quick. The Brownists and Separatists deal plainly with God and the world, and say expressly, that the whole Church of England, as it stands established by law, is peccant both in the doctrine, liturgy, and discipline of it, and in such a degree as that they neither will nor can join in communion with it, and therefore separate from it, and betake themselves to their own private opinions and congregations. But my Lord, he equivocates both with God and man, and tells us 'he believes there are true Churches in England, and a true ministry which he hears.' And this no Separatist that understands himself but will say as fast as he. But let his Lordship come home to the business directly and plainly. Let him say that the Church of England is a true Church; that the ministry of it is a true ministry; that the doctrine, liturgy, and discipline of it, as it stands established now by law, are free from any such corruptions as give just cause for a separation.

And when he hath said this, let him join in communion with it as he ought to do; and then he shall wrong my Lord very deeply, that says he is a Separatist.

But for all this which he hath yet said for himself, 'tis manifest, that a Separatist he is. And I doubt, hath hereby proved himself, whether I will or no, the greatest Separatist in England. And therefore he hath little cause to 'hope,' as

ıe says he doth, 'that he shall stand right in their Lordships' ›pinions,' or any other man's that is not possessed with the ıame humour. Yet my Lord hath two requests to make:—

> *I will now end with two requests: the one, that your Lordships will please to pardon me for troubling you with so long a discourse concerning myself. I have not used it heretofore, and I am not like to offend again in the same kind; it is but once, and your Lordships will consider the occasion.*

In this suit, were there need, I would join with my Lord; for though I have a great deal of hard measure put upon me in this speech, yet I have the more reason to be content with it, because this whole discourse of my Lord's, well weighed, is more against himself than me. And such trouble of his Lordship's, I hope all men, well affected to the present Church of England, will easily pardon. And this I doubt not, but their Lordships, and all men else, will the rather do, when they 'consider the occasion:' which certainly I gave not personally in the House; but a guilty conscience (it seems) would needs be meant.

> *The second* (request) *is, to entreat of you, that where you know there is one and the same God worshipped, one and the same faith embraced, one and the same Spirit working love, and causing an unblameable conversation, without any offence to the State, in your brethren, who in all these concur with you; you will not suffer them* (*for ceremonies and things indifferent to you, but not to them, but burthens, which without offence to the State, or prejudice to the Churches, you may take off if you will*) *to be thrust out of the land, and cut off from their native country. For if you thus shall wound the consciences of your brethren, you will certainly offend and sin against Christ.*

In this second request I can easily agree with my Lord in ıome things, but must differ in other. 1. And first, I agree ıvith all my heart, that I would have no pressure at all, much ıess 'cutting off from their native country,' put upon them ıvho 'are known to worship the same God, to embrace one ıand the same faith, and one and the same Spirit working love.' But in this I must disagree, that the Separatists (for

they are the men of whom this Lord speaks thus, and says they are your brethren, and concur with you in all these) are not known to be such. For though He be one and the same God whom they worship, yet the worship is not one and the same; for my Lord says plainly, 'that our set forms are superstition,' and that he cannot join in communion with us, 'till our yokes of bondage and our other gross corruptions be removed.' And I must doubt they embrace not the same faith, till they admit the whole Creed, and will use the Lord's Prayer, which few of them will. As for 'the Spirit that works by love,' I much fear He is a great stranger to many of these men; for I have many ways found their malice to be fierce, and yet endless. And therefore I wonder my Lord should have the boldness to tell my Lords in Parliament, that they know all these things of these men, and that they are their brethren, and concur with them in all these forenamed things, whom, in the meantime, their Lordships do and cannot but know different from them, nay, separating from them in the very worship of God.

2. Next, I agree with my Lord again, that I would have no pressure put upon those men, 'in whom the Spirit of love causes an unblameable conversation, without any offence to the State.' But in this I must disagree, that the Separatists from the Church of England are such manner of men; for the private conversation of very many of them (whom I could name were it fit) is far from being unblameable[1].

And the public conversation of all, or most of them, is full of 'offence to the State;' unless my Lord think the State is or ought to be of their humour. For how can their conversation be without great offence, very great, to this or any State Christian, who shall have and maintain private conventicles and meetings, in a different way of religion, from that which is established by the State? nay, which shall not only differ from, but openly and slanderously oppose, that which is so 50
established? Besides, no well-governed State will allow of private meetings, especially under pretence of religion, (which carry far,) without their privity and allowance; for if this be permitted, there lies a way open to all conspiracies against

[1] Here is a void space left, but never filled up.—H. W.

the State whatsoever, and they shall all be satisfied under the pretence of religion.

3. The third thing in which I agree with my Lord is, that I would not that 'for ceremonies and things indifferent, these men should be thrust out of the land, and cut off from their native country.' No, God forbid! if anything will reclaim them. But then I must disagree with my Lord in this, that these men (whether such as my Lord describes them or no) 'are thrust out of the land,' or 'cut off from their native country, for ceremonies or things indifferent.' For, first, they are not all ceremonies, for which they separate from the Church; for they pretend certain 'gross corruptions in the very worship of God,' (as my Lord a little before delivers.) Secondly, be the cause what it will, none of them have been banished, or 'thrust out of the land,' or 'cut off from their native country' (as is here spoken to move hatred against the government). But 'tis true, they have thrust themselves out, and cut themselves off, and run a-madding to New England, scared away, as they say, by certain gross corruptions not to be endured in this Church. Nor, after they have gone a-madding enough, is their return denied to any. And I know some that went out like fools, and are come back so like ——, that you cannot know the one from the other.

4. In this passage 'tis said by my Lord, 'that these ceremonies and things indifferent unto you,' (speaking to the Lords in Parliament,) 'are not so to them, but burthens.' In this passage I can agree with my Lord in nothing. For, first, my Lord but a very little before tells 'of yokes of bondage and gross corruptions.' And are they so soon become but 'ceremonies and things indifferent?' If they be more than 'ceremonies and things indifferent,' then my Lord delivers not the whole truth; and if they be but 'ceremonies and things indifferent,' then his Lordship and all other Separatists ought rather to yield to the Church in such things, than for such things to separate from it; and certainly so they would, 'if the Spirit that worketh by love' did work in them. Yea, but my Lord says they are such things as 'though they be indifferent to others, yet to them they are not, but burthens.' And it may be, they make them so; for in their own nature they are nothing less; and of great use they are to preserve

the substance and the body of religion. But this I find; let anything in the world be enjoined by the Church authority, and it is a burthen presently. And so you see all along this speech, how earnest my Lord is in behalf of himself and these Separatists, against all 'injunctions of set forms and yokes of bondage.' This is an excellent way of religion, to settle temporal obedience.

5. And I can as little agree with that which follows; namely, 'that the Lords may, without any offence to the State, or prejudice to the Churches, take away, if they will, these things indifferent to them, but burthens to these brethren.' For, first, suppose them to be but 'ceremonies and things indifferent,' yet can they not be taken away 'without offence 51 to the State, or prejudice to the Churches,' who, to please a few unruly Separatists, must make an alteration in that part of religion, which hath continued with great happiness to this Church ever since the Reformation. Secondly, I will not dispute it here, what power a lay assembly (and such a Parliament is) hath to determine matters of religion, primely and originally by and of themselves, before the Church hath first agreed upon them. Then, indeed, they may confirm or refuse. And this course was held in the Reformation. But originally to take this power over religion into lay hands, is that which hath not been thus assumed, since Christ to these unhappy days: and I pray God this chair of religion do not prove *cathedra pestilentiæ*, as the Vulgar reads it in Psal. i. 1, to the infecting of this whole nation with schism and heresy, and in the end bring all to confusion.

I meddle not here with the King's power. For he may be present in Convocation when he pleases, and take or leave any canons as he pleases, which are for the peace and well ordering of the Church; as well as in Parliament, take or leave any laws made ready for him, for the good and quiet of his people. But if it come to be matter of faith, though in his absolute power he may do what he will, and answer God for it after; yet he cannot commit the ordering of that to any lay assembly, Parliament, or other, for them to determine that, which God hath intrusted into the hands of His priests. Though, if he will do this, the clergy must do their duty, to inform him, and help that dangerous error if they can: but

ey cannot, they must suffer an unjust violence, how far
:r it proceed; but they may not break the duty of their
iance.

is true Constantius the emperor, a great patron of the
ıns, was by them interested in their cause, and meddled
cernendo[m], in determining, and that beforehand, what
prelates should do; and sometimes in commanding the
ɔdox prelates to communicate with the Arrians. This
refused to do, as being against the Canons of the Council
ice.

ıd then his answer was, 'Yea, but that which I will shall
ɔr canon[n].' But then we must know withal, that Atha-
ıs reckoned him for this, as that Antichrist which Daniel
hesied of[o].

osius also, the famous confessor of those times, con-
ıed in him that kind of meddling in and with religion[p].
so doth St. Hilary of Poictiers[q]. Valentinian also, the
ıger, took upon him to judge of religion, at the like persua-
of Auxentius the Arrian; but he likewise was sharply
ɔved for it by St. Ambrose[r]. In like manner, Maximus
yrant took upon him to judge in matters of religion, as
.e case of Priscillian and his associates. But this also was
ked by St. Martin, Bishop of Tours[s]: where it is again
: observed, that though these emperors were too busy in

'Ερημοῖ τὰς ἐκκλησίας παραλύων
ανόνας, καὶ τὰ ἴδια κρατεῖν βιαζό-
—S.] Athan. in Epist. ad solit.
agentes. [al. Hist. Arian. ad
:hos.] Edit. Gr. Lat. p. 862. [§ 77,
i. p. 390. D. Ed. Bened.]
λλ' ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι, τοῦτο κα-
ιεγε νομιζέσθω.—Epist. ad solit.
agentes. [Ibid. § 33. p. 363. E.]
ɛγὰρ βλέπων αὐτὸν ἐξάρχοντα τῶν
ιένων ἐπισκόπων, καὶ προκαθήμε-
ν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν κρίσεων, οὐκ ἀκο-
: [ἂν] εἴποι τοῦτ' εἶναι τὸ διὰ τοῦ
. εἰρημένον βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώ-
(cap. ix. 27); [S.] Athanas. in
ad solit. vitam agentes. Edit.
.t. p. 862. [§ 77. ibid. p. 390. D.]
ἢ τίθει σεαυτὸν εἰς τὰ ἐκκλησιασ-
ιηδὲ σὺ περὶ τούτων παρακελεύου,
ιᾶλλον παρ' ἡμῶν μάνθανε ταῦτα.]
Epistola ad Constantium, quæ
ıpud Athana. Ibid. p. 829. [§ 44,
. A. B.]
hristianum te loqueris; sed quam
non sis ipse testaris; nec professioni tuæ gesta conveniunt. Substravisti enim voluntati tuæ orientales episcopos, neque solum voluntati tuæ, sed et violentiæ."] St. Hilary cont. Constantium, Edit. Basil. p. 272, [§ 26. col. 1256. D. Paris. 1693,] et passim alibi.

[r] "Quando audiisti clementissime imperator in causa fidei laicos de episcopo judicasse? . . . Quis est qui abnuat in causa fidei, in causa inquam fidei, episcopos solere de imperatoribus Christianis, non imperatores de episcopis judicare? . . . Pater tuus . . . baptizatus in Christo, inhabilem se ponderi tanti putabat esse judicii," &c.—S. Amb. lib. v. Epist. xxxii. [(xxi. Ben. Op., tom. ii. coll. 860. E., 861. A.)]

[s] "Novum et inauditum nefas esse dicens, ut causam Ecclesiæ judex sæculi judicaret."—Sulp. Sever. lib. ii. Hist. Sacræ. [cap. 50. Op., p. 289. Lips. 1709.]

venturing upon the determination of points of faith, yet no one of them went so far, as to take power from the synods, and give it to the senate. And the orthodox and understanding emperors did neither the one nor the other. For Valentinian the elder left this great Church-work to be done by Churchmen[t]. And though the power to call Councils was in the emperor, and though the emperors were sometimes personally present in the Councils, and sometimes by their deputies, both to see order kept, and to inform themselves, yet the decisive voices were in the clergy only. And this will plainly appear in the instructions given by the Emperor Theodosius to Candidianus, whom he sent to supply his place in the Council of Ephesus; which were, 'That he should not meddle with matters of faith, if any came to be debated[u].' And gives this reason for it: 'Because it is unlawful for any but bishops to mingle himself with them in those consultations.' And Basilius the emperor, long after this, in the eighth General Council, held at Constantinople, *an.* 870[x], affirms it of the laity in general, 'that it is no way lawful for them to meddle with these things. But that it is proper for the patriarchs, bishops, and priests, which have the office of government in the Church, to inquire into these things[y].' And more of this argument might easily be added, were that needful, or I among my books, and my thoughts at liberty. And yet this crosses not the supremacy which the King of England hath in causes ecclesiastical: as it is acknowledged both by the Church and law. For that reaches not to the giving of him power to determine points of faith, either in Parliament or out; or to the acknowledgment of any such

[t] "Pater tuus, Deo favente, vir maturioris ævi, dicebat, non est meum judicare inter episcopos."—St. Amb. lib. v. Epist. xxxii. [xxi. Ben. Op., tom. ii. col. 861. A.]

[u] "Ut cum quæstionibus et controversiis quæ circa fidei dogmata incidunt, nihil quicquam commune habeat. Nefas est enim, qui sanctissimorum episcoporum catalogo ascriptus non est, illum ecclesiasticis negotiis et consultationibus sese immiscere."—Bin. tom. i. Conc. par. ii. p. 166. Ed. Colon. ['Εντέταλται τοίνυν Καυδιδιανὸς, ὁ μεγαλοπρεπέστατος κόμης τῶν δομεστίκων, ἀχρὶ τῆς ἁγίας ὑμῶν διαβῆναι συνόδου· καὶ μηδὲν μὲν ταῖς περὶ τῶν δογμάτων γινομέναις ζητήσεσι κοινωνῆσαι. ἀθέμιτον γὰρ, τὸν μὴ τοῦ καταλόγου τῶν ἁγιωτάτων ἐπισκόπων τυγχάνοντα τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς σκέμμασιν ἐπιμίγνυσθαι. —Conc. Labb. et Coss. tom. iii. coll. 442. E., 443. A.]

[x] *l.* 869.

[y] "Quod nullo modo iis liceat de ecclesiasticis causis sermonem movere. . . . Hoc enim quærere et investigare, patriarcharum, pontificum et sacerdotum est, qui regiminis officium sortiti sunt. . . . Nos autem oportet cum timore et fide sincera hos adire," &c.—Bin. tom. iii. Concil. par. ii. 682. [Conc. Labb. et Coss. tom. viii. col. 1154. C.D.]

power residing in him; or to give him power to make Liturgies, and public forms of prayer; or to preach or administer Sacraments; or to do anything which is merely spiritual. But in all things which are of a mixed cognisance, such as are all those which are properly called ecclesiastical, and belong to the bishops' external jurisdiction; the supremacy there, and in all things of like nature, is the King's. And if at any time the emperor or his deputy sit judge in a point of faith, it is not because he hath any right to judge it, or that the Church hath not right; but merely in case of contumacy, where the heretic is wilful, and will not submit to the Church's power.

And this the heretics sometimes did; and then the bishops were forced to appeal thither also; but not for any resolution in the point of faith, but for aid and assistance to the just power of the Church[z].

I cannot but remember a very prudent speech uttered in the beginning of the late preceding Parliament, and by that Lord who now made this. The occasion was, a Lord offered to deliver a message from the King before he was formally brought into the House and his patent showed. This Lord, who thinks Church-ceremonies may so easily be altered, stood up and said: 'He would not be against the delivery of the message; he knew not how urgent it might be; but desired withal that it might be entered, that this was yielded unto by special leave of the House. For that,' saith he, 'though this be but a ceremony, yet the honour and safety of the privileges of this great House is preserved by nothing more than by keeping the ancient rights and ceremonies thereof entire.' And this, I think, was very wisely spoken, and with great judgment. And could my Lord see this in the Parliament, and can he not see it in the Church? Are ancient ceremonies the chief props of Parliamentary rights, and have they no use in religion, to keep up her dignity; yea, perhaps, and truth too? The House of Parliament is, I confess, a great and honourable House; but the whole Church of Christ is greater. And it will not well beseem a Parliament to maintain their own ceremonies, and to kick down the cere-

[z] [Cassiod.] Hist. Trip. lib. v. 35, in the case of heretics. [p. 80. Francof. ad Mæn. 1588.]

monies of the national Church, which, under God, made all their members Christians. Most sure I am they cannot do it without offence both to State and Church, and making both a scorn to neighbouring nations.

Now, in the close of all, my Lord tells his fellow-peers, and all others in them, 'that if they shall thus wound the consciences of their brethren,' (the Separatists,) 'they will certainly offend and sin against Christ.' Soft and fair. But what shall these Lords do, if to humour the 'consciences of those brethren,' (some weak, and many wilful, and the cunning misleading the simple,) they shall disgrace and weaken, and perhaps overthrow, the religion they profess? Shall they not then both wound their own consciences, and most certainly sin against Christ? Yes, out of all doubt, they shall do both. Now, where it comes to the wounding of consciences, no question can be made but that every man ought first to look to his own; to his brethren's after. A man must not do that which shall justly wound his brother's conscience, though he be his brother in a separation, and stand never so much aloof from him. But he must not wound his own to preserve his brother from a wound, especially such a one as happily may cure him, and by a timely pinch make him sensible of the ill condition in which he is.

As for these men, God of His mercy give them that light of His truth which they want, and forgive them the boasting of that light which they presume they have. And give them true repentance, and in that sense a wounded conscience, for their breaking the peace of this Church.

And forgive them all their sins, by which they still go on 513
with more and more violence to distract this Church.

And God of His infinite goodness preserve this Church at all times, and especially at this time, while the waves of this sea of separation rage so horribly. And as for this Lord, God forgive him, and I do, and I hope this Church will. Amen.

In Turri Lond.
Dec. 3, 1641.

S. S. Trinitati sit laus et gloria in æternum.

AN

ANSWER

TO THE

SPEECH

OF

The Right HONOURABLE

WILLIAM

Lord Viſcount *Say* and *Seal*, *&c.*

SPOKEN IN

PARLIAMENT,

Upon the BILL about

BISHOPS POWER in CIVIL AFFAIRS,

AND

COURTS of JUDICATURE, *Anno* 1641.

By the Moſt Reverend

WILLIAM LAUD Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*,

Then Priſoner in the *TOWER*.

Non appoſui ultimam manum,

W. CANT.

monies of the national Church, [illegible]
their members Christians. M[illegible]
it without offence both to S[illegible]
both a scorn to neighbourin[illegible]

Now, in the close of all
all others in them, 't[illegible]
sciences of their bret[illegible]
tainly offend and [illegible]
what shall these [illegible]
those brethren [illegible]
cunning mi[illegible]
weaken, a[illegible]
Shall th[illegible]
most [illegible]
shal[illegible]
co[illegible]

[*This Answer is reprinted from the second volume of Laud's Works, Lond.* 1690, *the pages of which are noted in the margin.*]

[*This Answer is reprinted from the second volume of Laud's Works, Lond.* 1690, *the pages of which are noted in the margin.*]

ANSWER TO THE LORD SAY'S SPEECH

AGAINST

THE BISHOPS[a].

THIS speech is said to have done the Bishops, their calling, and their present cause a great deal of harm among the gentry, and divers sober-minded men: and therefore I did much wonder that so many learned bishops, present in the House to hear it, should not, (some of them,) being free and among their books, so soon as it was printed, give it answer, and stop the venom which it spits from poisoning, so many at least, as it's said to have done; especially that Bishop[b] who stands named in the margin, and against whom in particular the speech was in part directed, should (as I conceive) to vindicate himself, as well as the cause, have taken this task upon him. But since I see all men silent, and the speech go away in triumph, as if it were unanswerable truth, though the Bill be now passed, and the Bishops with their votes cast out of the House, and from all civil employment, yet I thought it fit, if not necessary, to call this speech to an account in every passage, and with all due respect approve what is just, and give the rest such an answer as it deserves. And though you may think this answer comes too late, as indeed it doth to remedy the present evil, yet I have thought fit to go on with these my endeavours, that if these

[a] [The speech is entitled, "A Speech of the Right Honourable William Lord Vicount Say and Seale, one of his Majesties most honourable privie councell, spoken in Parliament, upon the Bill against the Bishops." The volume is entitled, "Two Speeches in Parliament of the Right Honourable Lord Vicount Say and Seale. Lond. 1641."]

[b] [The Bishop of Lincoln. See just below.]

miserable distracted times have an end (which I have no hope to live to see), the errors of this speech may appear, and the Bishops perhaps recover their ancient rights. If not (as I confess 'tis very hard in England), that yet the world may see how unjustly they suffered, and with what misguided zeal this Lord hath fallen upon the Church, as indeed he hath done in all kinds. And I pray God something fall not therefore upon him and his. The speech then begins thus:—

My Lords, 4

I shall not need to begin as high as Adam in answer to what hath been drawn down from thence by a bishop[c] *concerning this question, for that which is pertinent to it will only be what concerns bishops, as they are ministers of the Gospel: what was before, being of another nature, can give no rule to this.*—[Speech, p. 1.]

Whether this reverend bishop, now Lord Archbishop of York, did begin his speech as high as Adam, I cannot tell, nor what proof he made after such beginning; for I was committed long before this speech was made: but if he did bring it down from Adam, I think there may be good reason for it; for it will appear, for the two thousand years before the Law, and for two thousand years more under the Law of Moses, that the priests, especially the high and chief priests, did meddle in all the great temporal affairs which fell out in their times.

And first for the time before the Law, 'tis manifest, and received by all men, that the *primogenitus*[d], the firstborn, was priest, and the firstborn in the prime and leading families were as the chief-priests in their several generations: and 'tis more than absurd to think, that all these prime men in their several families, first, and tribes after, being priests,

[c] The Bishop of Lincoln.

[d] "Sacerdotium erat ante legem, apud colentes Deum, secundum humanam determinationem, qui hanc dignitatem primogenitis attribuebant."—[S.] Tho. [Aquin. Sum. Theol.] i. 2. q. 103, à 1 ad 3.

"Ante tempus veteris legis non erant determinati ministri divini cultus, sed dicitur, quod primogeniti erant sacerdotes, qui duplicem portionem accipiebant."—[S.] Tho. [Aquin. Sum. Theol.] ii. 2. q. 87, à 1 ad 3.

And it is irrefragably manifest by the Lord's commands to Moses, that he should take the Levites instead of the firstborn, Numb. iii. 45. Why instead of the firstborn, if the firstborn did not perform the public service of the Lord before that time?

should be estranged from all their civil and temporal affairs, and leave them in the hands of younger and weaker men. And as before the Law there is no express text for this their forbearance to help to manage civil affairs, so neither can there any sufficient reason be given why they should abstain. Neither did they. For instance, Abraham was a priest, and a great one, for he was a patriarch, Heb. vii. 4. And his priesthood appears in that he was the first minister of the sacrament of circumcision, Gen. xvii. 23; and yet he managed his family, and trained up his servants in that which is most opposite to the priestly function, even for war. Nay, took them, and went in person against five kings, and redeemed his kinsman Lot by the sword, Gen. xiv. 14, 16. And Melchisedeck, who is expressly called the priest of the high God, was king of Salem also[e]: a king and a priest too, so both capable by one person. And as he received tithes as a priest, so no doubt can be made but he ordered and governed civil affairs as a king. Before these, Noah was a priest, and offered sacrifice, Gen. viii. 20, and yet all the great care and trouble of building the ark, and managing the preservation of the whole world, was committed to him by God Himself, and undertook by him, Gen. vi.

Under the Law the case comes under fuller and clearer proof. And in the first entrance, Moses himself was *sacerdos sacerdotum,* the man that consecrated Aaron, Exod. xl. 13[f], and after reckoned with Aaron among the priests of God, Psal. xcix. 6, and yet the whole princely jurisdiction resided
5 in him all his days. But God commanded him to settle the priesthood upon Aaron, to teach the world that few men's abilities were fit for the height of both those places, since Moses himself was ordered to ordain Aaron, and divide the burden. After this division the high priest did meddle in civil affairs, even the greatest, as well as Moses continued his care of the synagogue. In the numbering of the people for war, a thing of sole imperial cognisance, if any, Aaron was joined in commission with Moses by God Himself, to number them by their armies; and they did it, Numb. i. 3, 17, 44. In the ordering of the standards and ensigns of the children of Israel, in their removes from place to place, God's own

[e] Gen. xiv. 18; Heb. vii. 1. [f] Levit. viii. 1.

command came alike to Moses and Aaron, Numb. ii. 1, 2; the silver trumpets to call the assemblies of the people together did belong to Moses, the people had nothing to do with them; nor might they tumultuously assemble, but orderly as the sound of the trumpets directed them; but the priests the sons of Aaron were to sound them, Numb. x. 8, 9, 11[s]. And this duty lay upon them as well when they went to war, as when they sacrificed. In the survey of the Land of Promise, Aaron was interessed as well as Moses: and this appears plainly, first, in that when the spies (all save Joshua and Caleb) had brought up an evil report upon the land, the people fall into a murmuring, and were as mad against Aaron as against Moses, Numb. xiv. 2, 5. Secondly, because when the Land of Promise came to be divided among the tribes, no spiritual business was it, and yet in the commission which Moses gave for the solemn division of the land, both to Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasses on the one side of Jordan, and on the other side to the other tribes, and to all the princes of the several tribes of Israel, Eleazar the priest was first and principal, Numb. xxxii. 2, 28, and xxxiv. 17, even before Joshua himself: and that not only here during Moses his life, but even after, at the actual division of the land to every tribe, though Joshua was then the leader of the people, Josh. xix. 51. In the great murmuring of the people at Kadesh, for want of water, which was like enough to break out into an insurrection, the commission which God Himself gave out to gather the assembly together, and to satisfy the people with water out of the rock, (a harder thing for Moses to do when he looks upon the people, than for God when he looks upon the rock,) went jointly to Moses and Aaron, Numb. xx., and they performed it accordingly.

Thus far it went, and in all these great particulars in Aaron's lifetime; as if God would give a pattern in the first high priest under the Law, what his successors in some cases might, and in some must do in great and civil affairs. And not so only, but to instruct the successors of Moses also what value they should put upon Aaron and his successors, if they will follow the way which God Himself prescribed, and which hath been taken up and followed in all well-governed

[s] [Compare Bp. Andrewes's Sermon on Numb. x. 1—4, vol. v. p. 141.]

kingdoms, as well Christian as heathen, till this very time that this ignorant boisterous faction hath laboured to bear sway, as a learned countryman of ours hath observed[h]. And therefore though God set the pattern in Aaron, yet He continued it further, to show (as I conceive) that His will was it
6 should continue. For no sooner was Aaron dead but his son Eleazar succeeded in all those great civil employments, as well as in the priesthood. For when the people of Israel were come into the plain of Moab near Jericho, and were ready to enter into the Land of Promise, God Himself joined Eleazar with Moses for the numbering of all the people that were found fit for war, which they were to expect at their entrance into Canaan, Numb. xxvi. 1, 3. In the difficult point of inheritance for the daughters of Zelophehad, when they came and demanded right of Moses, their demand was made to him and Eleazar, and the princes of the congregation, Numb. xxvii. 2, which they would not have done, had not Eleazar had a vote in that judicature with Moses and the princes, Josh. xvii. 4. And no less than God Himself commanded Moses to declare Joshua to be his successor in the presence of the congregation; and orders, further, that Joshua shall stand before Eleazar the priest, and that Eleazar shall ask 'counsel for him after the judgment of Urim before the Lord,' Numb. xxvii. 18, 19, 23. Now I would fain know of this Lord whether Eleazar might give Joshua the counsel which he asked of God for him? If he might not, why did God appoint him to ask it for Joshua? If he might, then he might give counsel in temporal affairs, for so runs the text about the war to be had with the Canaanites: 'At Eleazar's word they should go out, and at his word they should come in, both Joshua and all the children of Israel.'

Phineas the son of Eleazar, but priest too, though not high priest till after his father's death, was employed by Moses in the war against the Midianites, Numb. xxxi. 6, and the trumpets put into his hands. After the victory over them, the captains and the spoil were brought to Moses, Eleazar, and the chief fathers of the congregation, to divide

[h] "They would have clergymen not admitted, or very sparingly, to matters of state, contrary to the practice of all well-governed commonwealths and of our own till these late years"—Geo. Cranmer, Epist. to Mr. Hooker, p. 13. [See Keble's Hooker, vol. ii. p. 764.]

them, v. 12, 26; and an express law ordained, that if there be a 'matter too hard for them in judgment,' (I pray mark it, 'tis 'between blood and blood, between plea and plea, between stroke and stroke;' these are no ecclesiastical matters, I trow,) 'that they should go unto the priests the Levites, and to the judges that shall be in those days,' Deut. xvii. 8, 9, and he that will not 'hearken unto the priest and judge shall die,' v. 12. Was the priest here excluded from all temporal affairs? Nay, was he excluded from any, when his judgment was required 'between blood and blood?' Nay, the Geneva note adds here, 'that the judge was to give sentence as the priests counsel him by the law of God[i];' which gives the priest a greater power than the judge, since he was to follow the priest's direction; and Dr. Raynolds tells us very learnedly, that this law was made to establish the highest court of judgment among that people, in which all harder causes both ecclesiastical and civil should be determined without further appeal[j]. When the people made war, and came nigh unto the battle, the priest was to approach and speak unto them; and when he had done, the officers were to speak to them likewise; which must needs imply that the priests which were present were not strangers to some at least of the counsels of the war, Deut. xx. 2, 5: and the whole law, the judicial as well as the rest, was delivered by Moses, after he had written it, unto the priests the sons of Levi, and unto all the 'elders of Israel,' Deut. xxxi. 9. So was the priest trusted with the custody and in the discussing of the law, and (as is before mentioned) Eleazar had his hand 7
in distributing the land of Canaan to the several tribes, as well as Joshua, and the other elders of Israel, Josh. xiv. 1.

Nay, though this were not ordinary and usual, yet Eli was so far trusted with, and employed in, temporal affairs, as that being high priest, he was also 'judge over Israel' forty years, 1 Sam. iv. 18; and after him Samuel, a Levite, judged Israel, and no man better. Yea, and after the captivity of Babylon also, for well near five hundred years, the priesthood had the greatest stroke in the government; as under the Maccabees, and they did all that belonged unto them very worthily, and

[i] Annot. in Deut. xvii. 9.
[j] Confer. with Hart, c. vi. divis. 2. p. 203. [Lond. 1598.]

it pleased God to make that family very victorious. After Samuel, when that people had kings to govern them, in that great and most unnatural conspiracy of Absalom against his father David, in that great distress, Hushai was ordered by David to return and mix himself with the counsels of Absalom, and to impart all things to Zadoc and Abiathar the priests, that by them and their sons, David might come to know what was useful or necessary for him to do, 1 Sam. xv. 27, 32, 35; and Hushai's making no scruple nor reply to this, makes it clear that Zadoc and Abiathar were formerly trusted with David's counsels, and that Hushai had observed them to be prudent and secret. And when David was old, he called a kind of parliament for the settling his son Solomon in the kingdom. To that great assembly he gathered together all the princes of Israel, with the priests and the Levites, 1 Chron. xxiii. 1, 2; so far was he from turning their 'votes out of the House' of that great consultation, that six thousand of them were by the wisdom of that senate made officers and judges throughout the kingdom, v. 4; and this was done on both sides of Jordan in all businesses of the Lord, and in the service of the king, 1 Chron. xxvi. 30, 32. In the beginning of Solomon's reign, Abiathar the high priest was in all the great counsels of that state, but falling into the treason of Adonijah, he was deprived by Solomon, and Zadok made high priest in his room, 1 Kings ii. 27, 35. And when Jehosaphāt repaired the decays of that state, he set the priests and the Levites in their right places again, according to that law in Deut. xvii. 8, 9, and restored to them that power in judicature which was by God's appointment settled in them, 2 Chron. xix. 8. And that he had relation to that law is manifest, because he pitches almost upon the same words, ver. 10, as Dr. Raynolds hath observed before me[k]. And Jehoiada the high priest was the preserver of Joash, the right heir of the crown, against the usurpations of Athaliah; and when he had settled him in his kingdom, though not without force of arms, and they also ordered by Jehoiada, 2 Chron. xxiii. 8, he was inward in his counsels, and was ruled by him in his marriage, 2 Chron. xxiv. 2; and he died with this testimony, that this young king 'did that which was

[k] Conf. with Hart, c. vi. divis. 2. p. 203. [Lond. 1598.]

right in the sight of the Lord, all the days wherein Jehoiada instructed him,' 2 Kings xii. But after his death you may read what befell Joash, 2 Chron. xxiv. In all the conduct of this people out of Egypt, in which many temporal businesses did occur, Aaron was joined with Moses in and through all. 'Thou leddest thy people like sheep,' saith the prophet, Psal. lxxvii., 'by' or 'in the hand of Moses and Aaron.' The prophet David was a great shepherd himself, and knew very 8
well what belonged to leading the people; and you see he is so far from separating Aaron from Moses in the great work of leading the people, that though they be two persons, and have two distinct powers, yet in regard the one is subordinate and subservient to the other, they are reputed to have but one hand in this great work. And therefore in the original, and in all the translations which render it, 'tis said *in manu*, not *in manibus*, 'in the hand,' not 'in the hands' of Moses and Aaron[l]. So necessary did God in His wisdom think it, that Aaron should be near about Moses in the government of His people. And as the priests and Levites were great men in the great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, so were two of them ever in all the lesser Sanhedrims in the several cities of every tribe; for so Josephus witnesses expressly, that two of them were ever allotted to each magistracy[m]. Jeroboam's sin it was, and a great one, to make the lowest of the people priests, (1 Kings xii. 13,) and I pray God it be not the sin of this age to make the priests the lowest of the people.

So by this I think it appears, that nothing of like antiquity can well be more clear than that four thousand years before and under the Law, the priests, especially the chief priests, did meddle in, and help manage the greatest temporal affairs. And this, as this honourable person cannot but know, so I presume he was willing warily to avoid; for he tells you he shall not need to begin so high. Not need? And why so? Why, it is because (saith he) the question is, only what concerns bishops, as they are ministers of the Gospel, and that which

[l] [Compare Bp. Andrewes's second Sermon in Lent, vol. ii. p. 16.]

[m] [Ἀρχέσθωσαν δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν ἄνδρες ἑπτά, οἱ καὶ τὴν ἀρέτην καὶ τὴν περὶ τὸ δίκαιον σπούδην προησκηκότες· ἑκάστῃ δὲ ἀρχῇ δύο ἄνδρες ὑπηρέται διδόσθωσαν ἐκ τῆς τῶν Λευϊτῶν φυλῆς.]—"Oppidatim præsint septem viri probatæ virtutis et justitiæ cultores: singulis magistratibus attribuantur duo ministri de tribu Levitica."—Joseph. lib. iv. Antiq. c. 8. [§ 14. Op., tom. i. p. 233. Amst. 1726.]

was before being of another nature, can give no rule to this.' No man doubts but this question in Parliament belongs only to bishops as they are ministers of the Gospel, nay more particularly than so, as they are ministers of the Gospel in the Church of England only; for either this must be said, or else granted it must be by this honourable Lord, that the Parliament of England takes upon them to limit episcopacy through all the Christian world, and to teach all states therein what they are to do with their bishops. And this were as bold a part for the English Parliament to do, as it is for a private Englishman to censure the Parliament. And truly, for my own part, I cannot tell how to excuse the Parliament in this. For though in the Act now passed[n], there be nothing enacted but that which concerns bishops and such as are in holy orders here, because their power stretches no further than this kingdom, yet their aim and their judgment is general. And this appears by the preface of that Act[o], which runs thus: 'Whereas bishops, and other persons in holy orders, ought not to be entangled with secular jurisdiction,' &c. 'Ought not:' therefore in their judgment 'tis *malum per se*, a thing in itself unlawful for any man in holy orders to meddle in, or help manage temporal affairs; for though their words be, 'ought not to be entangled,' (which, as that word 'entangled' bears sense in English, and stands for an absolute hindering of them from the works of their own calling, I grant as well as they,) yet the Act proceeds generally to divest them of all power and jurisdiction in civil affairs, whether they be 'entangled' with them or not.

9 But be it so, that this question belongs to bishops only as they are ministers of the Gospel, yet why may not the ancient usage before the Law, and the law of God Himself, give a rule to this? For sure, if they can give no rule in this, then can they give no rule to anything else under the Gospel, that is not simply moral in itself, as well as none to prelates, and their assisting in temporal affairs; which opinion how many things it will disjoint both in Church and State is not hard to see. First, then, I shall endeavour to make it appear, that the practice of pious men before the Law, and the precept of the Law, can give a rule to many things under the Gospel;

[n] Feb. 15, 164½. [o] [16 Car. I. cap. xxvii.]

and then I will examine how, and how far those things may be said to be of another nature, which is the reason given why they can give no rule in this.

For the first, that they can give a rule, I hope it will appear very plainly; for in things that are typical, the type must prefigure the antitype, and give a kind of rule to make the antitype known: therefore in typical things no question is or can be made, but that the things which were under the Law can give a rule to us Christians. Though this bold proposition runs universally, without excepting things typical or any other. Besides, the priests had a hand in all temporal affairs, and in matters which were no way typical, but merely belonging to order and government, as appears by the proofs before made. And therefore the Jews may be precedents for Christians, which could not possibly be if they could give us no rule. Nor is this any new doctrine; for that ancient Commentary under the name of St. Ambrose [p], tells us expressly, that that which is mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 30, is a custom of the synagogue which he would have us to follow. And as this doctrine is not new, so neither is it refused by later writers, and some of them as learned almost as this Lord; for that which was ordered, 1 Chron. xxiii. 30, that they should 'stand every morning and evening to thank and praise the Lord,' is precedent enough to presume that the like is not against the law of God. And Calvin speaks it out expressly. 'In regard,' saith he, 'that God Himself instituted that they should offer sacrifice morning and evening, *inde colligitur*, it is thence collected plainly, that the Church cannot want a certain discipline [q].' So here the Jews' discipline gives an express rule to us. And it is very learnedly and truly observed by a late writer of ours, 'That there is no such light to the true meaning of Scripture as the practice of matters contained in it under the synagogue, and

[p] "Traditio synagogæ est quam nos vult sectari." S. Ambros. in 1 Cor. xiv. 30. [leg. 31.] [S. Amb. Op., tom. ii. Append. col. 159. These Commentaries were certainly not written by S. Ambrose. Dom Pitra in the Spicilegium Solesmense, vol. i., makes it probable that the Commentaries on Rom. and Corinth., as printed at the end of S. Ambrose, were written by S. Hilary of Poictiers, the remainder of his Commentary being found, partly in Rhabanus Maurus, (under the name of S. Ambrose,) and partly printed for the first time in Spicileg. Solesm. vol. i. pp. 49—159.]

[q] ["Primum, quod statas horas Deus veteri populo esse voluit; inde colligimus non posse carere Ecclesiam certa disciplina."]—Calv. in Act. iii. 1. [leg. 3. p. 25. Op., tom. vi. Amst. 1667.]

in the Church afterwards [r].' Now what light can we possibly receive from the synagogue, if those things which were before can give no rule to us? Besides, for aught I know of this Lord's religion, he may brand all the Old Testament as deeply as the Manichees did of old, or go very near it, if it can give no rule, and so be of no use to Christians. St. Augustine was of another mind through all his books against Faustus the Manichee [s]. And St. Ambrose most expressly, and very frequently recommended this, *tanquam regulam*, as a rule to the people [t]. And in this very case of Episcopacy, Clemens Romanus tells us, 'there is a kind of parallel between bishops, presbyters, and deacons, in the one, and high priests, priests, and Levites in the other Church [u].' And St. Jerome speaks it out, that 'such as Aaron and his sons, and the tribe of Levi were in the temple, the same are bishops, presbyters, and deacons in the Church of Christ [v].' And this they might justly challenge to themselves, and make it a rule.

But 'tis time to proceed to other particulars. In the case of tithes we find that they were due *jure divino*, by divine right, to the priests under the Law, and some were paid before the Law, no man doubts; but many will not grant that there is any divine right, commanding or ordering them to be paid to the priests under the Gospel. Yet this is undeniable, that tithes have been paid to the ministers under the Gospel, in all or most parts of Christendom, for many hundreds of years together; and God be thanked the payment continues yet in some places. What was it then, if not 'divine right,' that gave the rule to Christians for this kind of payment, but the practice before the Law, and the precept under it? Shall we say here, as this Lord doth, that what was before can give no rule to this? Now God forbid. The whole Christian world thought otherwise.

[r] Her. Thorndike, Epistle to the Reader before his Tract of Religious Assemblies. [Works, vol. i. p. 101. Oxf. 1844.]

[s] S. Aug. contra Faustum. [See especially book vi. Op., tom. viii. coll. 339, seq.]

[t] "Vetera Scripta legis et prophetarum, tanquam regulam diligentissime commendavit Ambrosius in popularibus sermonibus." S. Aug. lib. vi. Confess. c. 4. [Op., tom. i. col. 214. B.]

[u] [Τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδομέναι εἰσὶ, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προστέτακται, καὶ λευῖταις ἰδίαι διακονίαι ἐπίκειντται.]—Clem. Ep. ad Corinth. pp. 52, 53. [§ 40. apud Cotel. Patres Apost. tom. i. p. 170.]

[v] "Quod Aaron et filii ejus, atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi episcopi, presbyteri atque diaconi vendicant in Ecclesia." — S. Hier. Ep. [cxlvi.] ad Evagr. [al. Evang. § 2. Op., tom. i. col. 1083. D. E. Venet. 1766.]

And whatsoever becomes of the controversy about tithes, yet this is certain, that the ministers of the Gospel ought to have a liberal and free maintenance. Men, whom they serve in and for Christ, must not open their mouths too often to preach, and muzzle them whom they should feed. And the rule for this is given by the Law, for it is written in the Law of Moses, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treads out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? or saith He it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes no doubt this is written,' 1 Cor. ix. 9. And yet how many of these oxen are poorly shuted, and in a manner muzzled, is evident enough. How comes this to pass? How? Why surely, the Apostle St. Paul was utterly deceived here, ask my Lord else; for he proves this point of their maintenance, because 'tis so written in the Law of Moses, whereas that Law which 'was before can give no rule to this.'

Again; 'The Lord Himself hath ordained,' so saith St. Paul, v. 14, 'that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.' Not starve by the Gospel, but live upon it; live plentifully and decently. But by what rule did the Lord Himself proceed in this? If His will had been His rule, no rule so straight, it could not but have been just. But St. Paul tells us there, v. 13, that God Himself proceeded by another rule. 'Do ye not know,' saith he, 'that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait on the altar are partakers with the altar?' Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Κύριος διέταξε, 'even so hath the Lord ordained.' Just so: that as the priests and Levites under the Law did wait on the altar and live by it, so must they who preach the Gospel, by the Gospel. Just so: why then, how did the priest under the Law live? 'Tis set down at large, Deut. xviii. 1, Numb. x. 9; and a very full portion they had, so full as that they might have no inheritance amongst their brethren, 'the Lord's portion' which was made theirs was so great, yet οὕτω, 'so' the Lord ordained for the ministers of the Gospel. Press this a little further and 'twill come to the quick. The priests and Levites under the Law, besides their partaking with the altar, had the tithes of all duly paid them. Will not οὕτω reach to this too? If so, then 'tis clear in the text, that 'the Lord Himself ordained'

payment of tithes to the ministers of the Gospel. For He ordained that the ministers of the Gospel should live of the Gospel, οὕτω, 'just as' the priests under the Law did of the altar. I will not be peremptory in this sense of the text, yet I would have it well considered. And howsoever, that a free and plentiful certain maintenance is the ordinance of the Lord Himself, is by this text as clear as the sun. Now this Lord should do well to tell St. Paul, that either he mistook the Lord's ordinance, or if he did not, that then the Lord Himself was mistaken in so ordaining for the ministers of the Gospel, 'because what was before can give no rule to this.'

Further yet, you may see the vanity, the nothing of this bold assertion in other particulars beside the case of tithing. For if neither the state of man before the Law, nor the Law itself, can give any rule in things of this kind, to us that live under the Gospel, then there is nothing in God's Law that can give a rule to us, but that a man may 'remove his neighbour's landmark,' he may 'lead the blind out of the way,' he may 'smite his neighbour,' so it be 'secretly,' he may marry in many degrees of consanguinity, and what may he not? For all these, and many things more, are prohibited only in the Law, Deut. xxvii., Levit. xviii.: but that going before can give no rule to these. Now, the Apostle tells us, 1 Cor. x. 6, 11, 'that those things were our examples, and written for our admonition.' And he speaks of things before and under the Law. And more generally, Rom. xv. 4, 'Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning.' Now, learn well and certainly we cannot, but by rule; and therefore most manifest it is, that those things which were before can give us rules, whatsoever is here said to the contrary.

Two things there are which work much with me, why this Lord should say that the things which were before and under the Law can give no rule in this: and if not in this, then not in things like to this. The one is the power which kings have in their several dominions over the external government and polity of the Church. The Apostle's rule goes in the general only, 'Let every soul be subject,' Rom. xiii. 1. But the rule drawn down to particulars is from the commended practice of the kings of Judah under the Law. Now if these can give us no rule, then we have none at all brought down

to particulars, wherein that power consists. And here this Lord being a known Separatist from the Church of England, (as appears most manifest y by another speech of his Lordship's in Parliament, and printed with this,) separates, I doubt, from her doctrine too, and will not (could he speak out with safety) allow kings any power at all in Church affairs, more than to be the executioners to see the orders of their assemblies executed, in such things as they need the civil sword. And therefore he doth wisely in his generation, to say, 'that 12
the things which were before can give no rule in this.'

The other is, that there is of late a name of scorn fastened upon the brethren of the separation, and they are commonly called Roundheads, from their fashion of cutting close and rounding of their hair: a fashion used in Paganism in the times of their mournings and sad occurrences, as these seem to do, putting on in outward show at least a sour look and a more severe carriage than other men [w]. This fashion of

[w] It is evident the Grecians did wear long hair, and therefore Homer calls them καρηκομόωντας Ἀχαιοὺς, *capite comatos Achivos*, lib. ii. Iliad. And Eustathius, commenting upon that place, saith, they wear it long at other times, but cut it in the time of sorrow. [p. 165, Romæ, 1542.] And Achilles and his company cut off their hair, and cast it upon the dead body of Patroclus to cover it. Homer, lib. xxiii. Il. And at the funeral of Achilles the Grecians are said to shed warm tears (κείροντό τε χαίτας) and to have cut their hair. Homer, lib. xxiv. Od.

That the Romans wore their hair long, is evident by Varro, who saith that barbers were not known in Italy before the year 454 post U. C. About that time Ticinius Menas brought them in. Varro, lib. ii. de Re Rust. cap. ult. [fol. 235. a. apud Script. de Re Rustica, Bonon. 1504.]

And that they did cut their hair at funerals is plain in Andreas Tiraquel. "Romani in aliis luctibus quam funerum capillum barbamque promittebant."—Annot. in Alex. ab Alex. lib. iii. cap. 7. [p. 307. Francof. 1594.] But then they cut them.

And when this "rounding" went close, indeed it came somewhat near baldness; which the Jews were likewise forbidden to make upon themselves for the dead, Deut. xiv. 1, and Jerem. xvi. 6.

And as this rounding of the head was sometimes a sign of superstitious sorrowing, so was it (with some difference) used as an effeminate and luxurious fashion. And therefore Ganymedes were said περικείρεσθαι, *circumtondere*. Dio Chrysost. Orat. 2. de Regno. [p. 20. Lut. 1604.] And harlots.

After which manner they say harlots were cut, εἶναι δὲ περιτρόχαλον. And that it was a kind of rounding the head, Hesychius in Lexico, verbo σκαφίον, [tom. ii. col. 1204. Lugd. Bat. 1766.] Which kind of rounding the hair Tertullian mentions, lib. de Cultu Fœminarum, cap. 8. ["Propriasque præstigias formæ et hic sexus sibi agnoscit, barbam acrius cædere, intervellere, circum radere, capillum disponere."—Tert. de Cult. Fœm. lib. ii. cap. 8. Op., p. 157. C.] and lib. de Pallio, cap. 4, he objects the use of it to his Carthaginians. [The whole chapter is occupied with arguments against the practice.]

And in some places, this "rounding" of the head was a mark of servitude and vassalage, as among the ancient French, where the King only and the heir apparent had *jus capiliitii*, in token of his regality, and the rest were *circumtonsi*. (Selden, Præfat. to his Titles of Honour, ex Cedreno.) [This was in the Preface to the first edition of the Titles of Honour. See

rounding the head God Himself forbids His people to practise, the more to withdraw from the superstitions of the Gentiles: 'Ye shall not round the corners of your heads,' Lev. xix. 27. This express text of Scripture troubled the Brownists and the rest extremely; and therefore this Lord, being a great favourer of theirs, if not one himself, hath thought upon this way to ease their minds and his own. For 'tis no matter for this text, nor for their resembling heathen idolaters; they may round their heads safely, since those things 'which were before can give no rule in this.' And I do not doubt but that if this world go on, the dear sisters of these rattleheads will no longer keep silence in their churches or conventicles, since the Apostle surely is deceived, where he saith that 'women are not permitted to speak in the churches, because they are to be under obedience, as also saith the Law,' 1 Cor. xiv. For the Law, and those things 'which were before, can give no rule in this;' and therefore they 'shall not need to go as high as Adam' to answer this. They shall not need in this, nor we in that of Episcopacy, 'go so high as Adam.' But yet we may if we will, for so high the Apostle goes in this place.

And I thank this Lord for that liberty (if he means so well), that though we 'need not go so high,' yet we may if we list. And this is most certain, that any State Christian may receive all or as much of the judicial law of Moses as they please, and find fit for them; and as much of the ceremonial as detracts not from Christ come in the flesh. And since all law is a rule, this could not be done if those laws, being before, could be no rule to us.

This is proof enough, as I conceive, that these things which were before can give a rule to us now under the Gospel. My Lord thinks not so, for this reason, 'because they are of
13 another nature.' Secondly, therefore, the reason comes to be examined. Wherein I shall weigh two things: first, whether the Law of Moses and the Gospel of Christ are things 'of another nature,' and how far? and, secondly, whether this be universally true, that among things of another nature one cannot give a rule to another?

Works, vol. iii. p. 94. Lond. 1726.] But whether our Roundheads do it for superstition, or for luxury, or out of any base and servile condition, I cannot tell; though I think there need be little question but that many of them are guilty of all three, their hypocrisy being not a robe large enough to hide all of them; and some of their conventicles have of late heard ill.

1. For the first, I shall easily acknowledge a great deal of difference between the Law and the Gospel. They differ in the strictness of the covenant made under either: they differ in the sacraments and sacramentals used in either: they differ in the extent and continuance of either: they differ in the way and power of justifying a sinner; and perhaps in more things than these. And in these things in which they thus differ, and *qua*, as they so differ, the Law can give no rule to Christians; but whether these differences do make the Law and the Gospel things of quite 'another nature,' (which are the words here used,) I cannot but doubt a little. First, because more or less strictness doth not vary the covenant in nature, though it doth in grace; for *magis et minus non variant speciem*[x], more or less in anything does not make a specifical difference, and therefore not in nature. And use of different sacraments doth not make things to be 'of another nature,' where *res sacramenti*, the substance of the sacrament, is one and the same. And so 'tis here; for one and the same Christ is the substance of circumcision and the paschal lamb, as well as of Baptism and the Eucharist. For our fathers under the Law 'did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink of the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ,' 1 Cor. x. 3, 4. And much less can extent or continuance vary nature. Not extent; for fire contained in a chimney and spread miserably over a city, is one and the same in nature. Not continuance; for then a father and his son should not be of the same nature, if the one live longer than the other. And as for the way and power of justification, they difference the Law and the Gospel, not so much in their nature as in their relation to Christ, who alone is our justification, 1 Cor. i. 30, and was theirs also who lived under the Law, for both they and we were and are justified by the same faith in the same Christ.

And this seems to me very plain in Scripture: 'For to this day,' saith the Apostle, 'the vail remains upon the Jews in the reading of the Old Testament, which vail is done away

[x] And so Aristotle pursues it. "Imperare et parere, non differunt secundum magis et minus, quia differunt specie." [Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχεσθαι καὶ ἄρχειν, εἴδει διαφέρει, τὸ δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον, οὐδέν.]—Arist. lib. ii. Polit. cap. 8. [p. 28. Oxon. 1810.]

in Christ, but we all with open face behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord,' 2 Cor. iii. 14, 18. So one and the same Christ is in the Old Testament as well as in the New. Not so plainly; but there, though under a vail. Now a vail on and a vail off, a dimmer and a clearer sight in and by the one than by the other, do in no case make the things 'of another nature.'

Again; we find it expressly written, Gal. iii. 24, that 'the Law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith.' 'Our schoolmaster;' therefore it must needs be able to give rules unto us, or else it can never teach us. And the rules it gives are very good too, or else they can never 'bring us unto Christ, that we may be justified by faith;' which to do, St. Paul here tells us, is the
14 end of the Law's instruction. And this instruction it could not so fully give, if this schoolmaster were so 'of another nature as that it could not give us a rule in this.'

Besides, the type and the antitype, the shadow and the substance, howsoever they may be 'of another nature,' if you look upon their entity, yet in their relative nature, as type and antitype, shadow and substance, they are of the same nature, and have mutual dependence either upon other, and give rules mutually either to other, and a proof one of another. For a man may take the measure of the body by the shadow, and of the shadow by the body. And so it is between the Law and the Gospel; the sacrifices in the one, and Christ in the other. 'For the Law had but the shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things themselves, and therefore with those sacrifices could make nothing perfect,' Heb. x. 1. But 'Christ is the body' itself, Col. ii. 17. And 'when He came into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and burnt-offering Thou wouldest not have, but a body hast Thou given me,' Heb. x. 4. How shall this appear? How? Why, by the very rules given in the Law. For so the prophet tells us in the person of Christ: 'In the volume of the book it is written of Me,' Psal. xl. 7. Nay, so says Christ Himself, St. John v. 46, 'Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed Me, for he wrote of Me.' And to bring all home close to the present business; Christ, as God, of another nature quite from Melchisedek, yet in relation to the priesthood, as

type and antitype, not so; for Christ was man also, and the one gave a kind of rule to the other: For Christ was 'made a Priest after the order of Melchisedek,' κατὰ τὴν τάξιν: or as Mont. reads in the margin, *secundum morem*, according to the form, manner, or rule of Melchisedek's priesthood. And as Melchisedek and Christ are type and antitype in their priesthood, so the priesthood of Aaron under the Law was but a shadow of the priesthood of Christ under the Gospel[1]. And therefore the priesthood which is now, ought in all privileges to exceed that under the Law, inasmuch as the antitype and the body is of more worth than the type and the shadow. I say, in all privileges which are not appropriated by God Himself to the priesthood of the Law.

2. Secondly, it may be considered too, whether this be universally true; that among things which are of another nature, one cannot give a rule to another. For my own part I doubt there is not truth in the rule, but instead of truth a great deal of danger. And surely, if this be generally true, that 'that which was before (being of another nature) can give no rule to this;' that is, if that which was both before and under the Law concerning priesthood can give no rule, none at all, to the ministry under the Gospel, then can it give no rule in anything else: because the Law is as much 'of another nature,' in regard of other things, as of this. Nay, this very thing, the priesthood, makes the Law to be 'of another nature' more than anything else. And so the Apostle plainly, Heb. vii. 12: 'For the priesthood being changed, [there is] made of necessity a change also of the law.' But be this change, this other nature, what it will, if the Law can give no rule at all in this, (which again is directly contrary to the Apostle, 1 Cor. ix. 9, 13,) then can it give no rule in anything else pertaining to the Gospel. For the reason if it be good, holds alike, 'tis of another nature.

Nay, yet further, if this reason be true, universally true, (as 'tis here given,) then it reaches to and through the whole Law. No part of it can give any rule to men or things under the Gospel. For if no rule to things, then none to men, who must do or leave undone; and if so, then the moral law can

[1] "For those priests served but to the example, and to the shadow, &c. But now hath He obtained a more excellent ministry," Heb. viii. 5, 6.

give no rule to men under the Gospel, more than the ceremonial or the judicial law. For the whole Law was before the Gospel, and here said, without any distinction, to be 'of another nature,' and so unable to give a rule. And, for aught I know, this zealous Lord may be of this opinion. For this lewd doctrine hath been somewhat common of late among his favourites, that 'moral honesty is an enemy to the grace of Christ;' that 'harlots and debauched persons are nearer to the kingdom of God than they which labour to show themselves moral men,' and the like. As if they went to teach the people to live lewdly, and to 'do evil that good may come' thereof, 'whose damnation,' the Apostle tells us, 'is just,' Rom. iii. 8. Whereas Christ 'came not to take away the law, but to fulfil' it for us, Matt. v. 17, and in some measure to enable us to keep it also. And in the Gospel, when the scribe told our Saviour, that to 'love God with all the heart, and his neighbour as himself,' (upon which commandments hang the whole law, S. Matt. xxii. 40,) 'was more than all burnt sacrifices,' our Saviour did not tell him that 'harlots were nearer the kingdom of God than he,' or that this law, 'being of another nature, could give him no rule' for his life. But, quite contrary, He told him for his comfort, and the comfort of obedience, that he was 'not far from the kingdom of God,' S. Mar. xii. 34. And though this be bad enough, and will prove a fruitful mother of all libertinism and profaneness, yet there is a greater danger behind. For if the grace of Christ under the Gospel be a discharge of the moral law, and disenable it to give a rule, as being 'of another nature,' what shall become of God the Lawgiver Himself in all kinds? For He is quite 'of another nature,' eminently and infinitely exceeding us, and whatsoever is or can be naturally in us; yea, or supernaturally either. And what now? Shall not God Himself being 'of another nature' give us any rule in this or anything else? I know this Lord will say, this is not his meaning. No, truly, I hope it is not. But then, this Lord, if he will needs be writing and printing, should so express himself as that he may not expose his words to such unsavoury consequences as (for aught I know) may justly be gathered from them. And let me tell him in the meantime, 'tis a dangerous thing to be so busy with the

law of God; and so without distinction, as he is, lest he intrench upon the Lawgiver before he be aware.

Howsoever, in this proposition of his, that 'that which is before, being of another nature, can give no rule to this,' leaves him at a loss which way soever to turn himself. For, since 'tis manifest by the Apostle in the places before cited[1], that the Law of Moses, which was before, doth give a rule to divers things under the Gospel, this Lord of the separation is at a loss every way. For if the Law and that which was 16
before be not 'of another nature' from this, then his reason is false, which says it 'can give no rule' because 'tis 'of another nature,' and so he is at a loss in that. And if it be of another nature, yet it appears by the Apostle's practice, that for all that it can give a rule in this. For that which can give the Apostle a rule, can give a rule to us: and so he is at a loss in the whole proposition. For, whether that which was before be or be not 'of another nature,' yet it can give a rule.

I have been long upon this passage, because I conceive the main controversy hangs and turns upon this hinge. And if any reader think it long or tedious, or be of this Lord's mind, that he need not go so high for proof, yet let him pardon me, who in this am quite of another judgment. And for the pardon, I shall gratify him by being as brief as possibly I can in all that follows. Thus then this Lord proceeds:—

> *The question which will lie before your Honours in passing this Bill, is not, Whether Episcopacy (I mean this hierarchical episcopacy which the world now holds forth to us) shall be taken away, root and branch; but, Whether those exuberant and superfluous branches, which draw away the sap from the tree, and divert it from the right and proper use, whereby it becomes unfruitful, shall be cut off, as they use to pluck up suckers from the root.* [p. 1.]

After this Lord had told us we need not go so high for the business, he comes now to state the present question; where he tells us what he himself means by Episcopacy, namely, 'hierarchical episcopacy,' such as is properly and now commonly so called in the world. And this his Lordship adds

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 9, 13, 14; Rom. xv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 6, 11.

because of that distinction made by Beza in his tract, *De Triplici Episcopatu, Divino scilicet, Humano et Satanico;* in which what part Beza plays I will forbear to speak, but leave him and his 'gall of bitterness' to the censure of the learned[a]. Sir Edw. Deering, in his printed Speeches[b], tells us that others in a milder language keep the same sense, and say there is *Episcopus, Pastor, Præses,* and *Princeps.* So in his account, *Episcopus, Princeps,* and *Satanicus,* is all one in milder terms. But the truth is, that in the most learned and flourishing ages of the Church, the Bishops were, and were called *Principes,* chief and prime, and prince, if you will, in Church affairs. For so Optatus calls them, the chief and princes; and so likewise did divers others of the Fathers, even the best learned and most devout[c]. And this title is given to diocesan or hierarchical Bishops, which doubtless these Fathers would neither have given nor taken, had *Episcopus, Princeps,* and *Satanicus* been all one. Nor would Calvin have taught us that the primitive Church had in every province among their Bishops one Archbishop, and that in the Council of Nice Patriarchs were appointed which should be in order and dignity above Bishops[d], had he thought either such Bishops or Archbishops to have been 'satanical:' and had Beza lived in those times, he would have been taught another lesson. And the truth is, Beza, when he wrote that

[a] [Beza's tract was answered by Dr. Hadrian Saravia in his "Examen Tractatus de Episcopatuum triplici genere."]

[b] [A Collection of Speeches in matter of Religion,] sect. 16, p. 122, [p. 72. Lond. 1642.]

[c] ["Apices et principes omnium." —Optat. lib. [i.] adv. Parm. [p. 15. Paris. 1679.]

"Princeps Ecclesiæ."—S. Hilar. lib. viii. De Trin. Prin. [Op., col. 947. B. Paris. 1693.]

Greg. Nazianz. ascribit ἄρχην, principatum, ac regimen animarum Episcopo.—Orat. xvii. et xx. [Ἄρχομεν γὰρ αὐτοὶ, προσθήσω δ' ὅτι καὶ τὴν μείζονα καὶ τελεωτέραν ἀρχήν.—S. Greg. Naz. Orat. xvii. Op., tom. i. p. 271. B. Ἄρχοντος δὲ καὶ προστάτου κακίαν, καὶ μάλιστα τὴν τοιαύτην ἄρχην, τὸ μὴ πολὺ τῶν πολλῶν προέχειν.—Orat. xx. ibid. p. 343. C. Paris, 1630.]

"Quid aliud est Episcopus quam is qui omni principatu et potestate superior est? in materia et gradu religionis."—[Τί γάρ ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπος; ἀλλ' ἢ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας ἐπέκεινα πάντων κρατῶν.]—Ignat. Ep. [interp.] ad Trall. [Cot. Pat. Ap. tom. ii. p. 63.]

"Principes Ecclesiæ fiunt," &c.—Opus imperf. in S. Matth. Hom. 35. [Apud S. Chrysost. Op., tom. vi. Append. p. cliii.]

"Principes futuros Ecclesiæ Episcopos nominavit."—S. Hier. in Esai. vi. 60. [lx. 17, 18. Op., tom. iv. col. 728. E.]

[d] "Quod autem singulæ provinciæ unum habebant inter Episcopos Archiepiscopum, quod item in Nicena Synodo constituti sunt Patriarchæ, qui essent ordine et dignitate Archiepiscopis superiores, id ad disciplinæ conservationem pertinebat."—Calv. 4. Inst. [cap.] iv. [§] 4. [Op., tom. ix. p. 286.]

tract, had in that argument either little learning or no honesty. But for this Lord, whether he means by 'hierarchical episcopacy' the same which Beza, I will not determine. He uses a proper word and a civil, and I will not purpose to force him into a worse meaning than he hath, or make him a worse enemy to the Church (if worse he may be) than he is already. Though I cannot but doubt he is bathed in the same tub.

Having told us what he means by Episcopacy, he states the business thus: That 'the question is not whether this hierarchical episcopacy shall be taken away, root and branch.' So then, I hope this Lord will leave a hierarchy (such as it shall be) in the Church. We shall not have it all laid level. We shall not have that curse of 'root and branch[e]' (for less it is not) laid upon us: or, at least, not yet. But what shall follow in time, when this bill hath used its edge, I know not. Well, if not root and branch taken away, what then? What? why, 'tis but 'whether those exuberant and superfluous branches, which draw away the sap from the tree, and divert it from the right and proper use, whereby it becomes unfruitful, shall be cut off, as they use to pluck up suckers from the root.' This Lord seems to be a good husbandman; but what he will prove in the orchard or garden of the Lord, I know not: for most true it is that suckers are to be plucked from the root; and as true, that in the prime and great Vine there are some branches which bear no fruit, and our Saviour Himself tells us, that they which are such 'are to be taken away,' St. Joh. xv. 2. And therefore I can easily believe it, that in Episcopacy, which is a far lower vine under and in the service of Christ, and especially in the husbanding of it, there may be some such branches as this Lord speaks of, which draw sap and divert it, and make the vine less fruitful; and no doubt but such branches are to be cut off. So far I agree, and God forbid but I should. But then, there are divers other questions to be made and answered before this sharp Lord fall to cutting. As, first, What branches they be which are 'exuberant and superfluous' (as this Lord is pleased to call them)? What time is fittest to cut them off? Whether they be not such as with pruning may be made

[e] Job xviii. 16.

fruitful? If not, then how near to the body they are to be cut off? Whether this Lord may not be mistaken in the branches which he thinks 'divert the sap?' Whether a company of laymen, without any order or ordinance from Christ, without any example from the days of Christ, may, without the Church, take upon them to prune and order this vine? For, whatever this Lord thinks in the over-abundance of his own sense, the Lord hath appointed husbandmen to order and prune this vine, and all the branches of it, in His Church, without his usurpation of their office: and while he uses a bill (which is too boisterous a weapon for a vine) instead of a pruning-hook, the Church itself, which is the vine which bears Episcopacy, may bleed to death in this kingdom before men be aware of it. And I am in great fear, if things go on as they are projected, that religion is upon taking its leave of this kingdom. But this Lord hath not quite done stating the question, for he tells us next that—

> *The question will be no more but this, Whether Bishops shall be reduced to what they were in their first advancement over the Presbyters, (which, although it were but a human device for the remedy of schism, yet were they in those times least offensive,) or continue still with the addition of such things as their own ambition, and the ignorance and superstition of succeeding times, did add thereunto, and which are now continued for several political ends; things heterogeneal, and inconsistent with their calling and function as they are ministers of the Gospel, and thereupon such as ever have been, and ever will be, hurtful to themselves, and make them hurtful to others, in the times and places where they are continued.* [pp. 1, 2.]

Here my Lord states the question again. He did it before under the metaphor of a tree and the branches. Here, that men of 'narrow comprehensions[f]' may not mistake him, he lays it down in plain terms, and tells us the question is no more but this, 'Whether Bishops shall be reduced to what they were in their first advancement over the Presbyters?' And you may be sure they shall be reduced, if they

[f] [See above, p. 87.]

once fall into the hands of this zealous Lord. Reduced, out of doubt, every way, if he may have his will, saving to that which they were in the original, which his Lordship calls 'their first advancement over the presbyters.' For my own part, if it be thought fit to reduce the Christian Church to her first beginnings, give us the same power, and use us with the same reverence for our works' sake, as then our predecessors were used, and reduce us, in God's name, when you will. But this Lord's zeal burns quite another way. He tells us, indeed, that 'the question is no more but whether Bishops shall be reduced to what they were in their first advancement over the presbyters;' but he means nothing less than their reducement thither: and this is manifest out of his own next words. For there he says, their first advancement was 'but a human device for avoiding of schism.' 'But a human device?' Why, first, our Saviour Himself chose twelve Apostles out of the whole number of His disciples, and made them bishops, and advanced over the presbyters and all other believing Christians, and gave them the name of Bishops as well as of Apostles; as appears, since that name was given even to Judas also, as well as to the other Apostles, and to the other Apostles as well as to Judas, since Matthias was chosen by God Himself, both into the bishopric and apostleship of Judas, Acts i. 20, 24, 25. Now that Christ Himself did ordain the Apostles over the ordinary disciples, presbyters or others, is evident also in the very text; for He chose them out of His disciples, S. Luke vi.[g] And to what end was this choosing out, if after this choice they remained no more than they were before? Nay, He chose them out with a special ordination to a higher function, as appears S. Mark iii., where 'tis said, 'He ordained twelve that they should be with Him;' that is, in a higher and nearer relation than the rest were. Nay, more than so, the word there used by S. Mark is ἐποίησεν, 'He made' them; 19
He made them somewhat which before that making they were not, that is, Apostles and Bishops. Had they been such before, it could not have been said that 'He made' them then. And our last translation renders it very well, 'He ordained them:' so belike this making was a new ordination

[g] S. Luke vi. 13, ἐκλεξάμενος.

of them. And this appears further by the choice of Matthias into the apostleship of Judas: for Matthias was one of the seventy when he was chosen[h]; and then this choice needed not, if the LXX. had been before of equal place and calling with the Apostles. For, as S. Jerome speaks, he that is preferred, is preferred *de minori ad majus*, from a less and a lower to a greater and a higher degree[i]. Now, it is *traditio universalis*, the constant and universal tradition of the whole Church of Christ, which is of greatest authority next to Scripture itself, that Bishops are successors of the Apostles, and Presbyters made in resemblance of the LXX. disciples[k]. And so the institution of Christ Himself (for so, by this Lord's leave, I shall ever take Episcopacy to be) is made 'but a human device to avoid schism.' But there hath been so much written of late to prove Episcopacy no human device, that I will not trouble the reader with any more of it here. Only we are thus far beholding to this Lord, that he thinks Bishops were 'in those times least offensive;' so, belike, in the Apostles' times they were offensive, though less. And this makes me doubt he thinks as much of the Apostles themselves, since they were so ambitious as to take on them superiority over their brethren, which this great Lord of the Separation (for so he is) cannot endure, as being antichristian, and therefore certainly (if he may have his will)

[h] Euseb. lib. i. Hist. c. 12, lib. ii. c. 1.

[i] ["Non dico de Episcopis, non de inferiori gradu."]—S. Hier. Epist. lxix. ad Ocean. [§ 2. Op., tom. i. col. 412. D.]

[k] "Apud nos Apostolorum locum tenent Episcopi: apud eos (i. e. Montani sectatores) Episcopus tertius est."—S. Hier. Ep. [xli. (al. liv.) § 3,] ad Marcell. adv. Montan. [Op., tom. i. col. 189. C.]

"Patres missi sunt Apostoli, pro Apostolis filii nati sunt, ibi constituti sunt Episcopi."—S. Aug. in Psal. xliv. [§ 32. Op., tom. iv. col. 564. C.]

"Sicut autem duodecim Apostolos formam Episcoporum [exhibere simul et] præmonstrare, nemo est qui dubitet, sic et hos LXXII. figuram Presbyterorum, i. e. secundi ordinis sacerdotium gessisse sciendum est."—Beda in Luc. x. [Op., tom. v. col. 328. Colon. Agr. 1612.]

"Apostoli cognoverunt contentionem de Nomine Episcopatûs oboriturum, et ideo constituerunt prædictos, et cum consensu universæ Ecclesiæ." Clem. Ep. i. ad Corinth. p. 57. [Καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπὶ νομὴν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, . . . τούτους οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβαλέσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας. Cotel. Patr. Apost. tom. i. p. 173.]

But I am prevented here by a chaplain of mine, Mr. Jer. Taylor, in his book entituled, 'Episcopacy Asserted,' § 10. [Works, vol. v. pp. 40—42. Lond. 1849.]

will reduce the Bishops further yet, till they be of his marring, and not of Christ's making.

The other part of the question stated by this Lord is, 'Or whether the Bishops shall continue still with the addition of such things as their own ambition, and the ignorance and superstition of succeeding times, did add unto them.' I would my Lord had been pleased to tell us what those things are, which he says are thus added unto them. I should much the better have seen what his Lordship aims at, and been able to come up the closer to him. Now I must be forced to answer him in general. That there are many things of honour and profit, which emperors and great kings have conferred upon bishops to the better settlement of their calling, and the great advancement of Christianity; and for which bishops in all times and places, in which they have lived, have been both thankful and very serviceable. And I could give many instances in this kingdom of such services done by them, as this Lord and all his posterity will never equal. But 'what things their own ambition or the ignorance and superstition of succeeding times have added to them,' I may know when this busy Lord is at leisure to tell me. In the meantime I doubt the piety and devotion of these times is here miscalled 20
'ignorance and superstition,' while the knowledge of these times, in too many, is a running headlong into sacrilege, as the best way to cure superstition.

But these things, whatever they be, his Lordship tells us, 'are now continued for several politic ends.' Yea, and with his Lordship's favour, for several and great religious ends too. But if they were continued for politic ends only, so the policies be good and befitting Christians, I know no reason why they may not be continued. For, as for that which is here given by this Lord, 'tis either weak or false. He says these things are 'heterogeneal to their function;' that's weak. For, 'tis not possible for any priest, that is not cloistered, to live so in the world, as to meddle with nothing that is 'heterogeneal to their function.' And he says further, that these things are 'inconsistent with their function;' and that's false. For if these things were simply 'inconsistent' with priesthood, God Himself would never have made Eli both priest and judge in Israel: nor should six of each tribe have

been of the Sanhedrim, and so by consequence six of the tribe of Levi; and so the high priest might be always one, and a chief in that great court, which had cognisance of all things in that government[1]: and their function, as they are ministers of the Gospel, is no more inconsistent with these things than the Levitical priesthood was. For beside their sacrificing, they were to read and expound the Law, as well as we the Gospel. For so it is expressly set down, Deut. xxxiii. 10, 'they' (that is, the tribe of Levi) 'shall teach Jacob Thy judgments, and Israel Thy laws.' So that meddling with temporal affairs was as great a distraction to them from their calling, as from ours; and as 'inconsistent' with it, and so as hurtful to their consciences and their credits. And would God put all this upon them, which this Lord thinks so unlawful for us, if it were so indeed? But this Lord goes yet further, and tells us, that these things are 'such as have ever been, and will ever be, hurtful to themselves, and make them hurtful to others in the times and places where they are continued.' Good God! what fools we poor bishops are, as were also our predecessors for many hundred years together, that neither they nor we could see and discern what was and is 'hurtful to ourselves,' nor what then did, or yet doth, 'make us hurtful to others, in times and places where they are continued to us!' And surely, if my Lord means by this our meddling in civil affairs, when our Prince calls us to it (as I believe he doth), I doubt his Lordship is much deceived; for certainly, if herein the Bishops do their duties, as very many of them in several kingdoms have plentifully done, they cannot hurt themselves by it; and to others, and the very public itself, it hath occasioned much good both in Church and State. But now my Lord will not only tell us what these things are, but he will prove it also that they are hurtful to us.

And these things alone (says my Lord) *this Bill takes away; that is, their offices and places in courts of judicature, and their employment by obligation of office in civil affairs. I shall insist upon this to show, first, how these things*

[1] Bertram de Polit. Jud. cap. vi. [p. 35. Genev. 1580.]

hurt themselves; and, secondly, how they have made, and ever will make them hurtful to others. [p. 2.]

These things then, you see, which are so hurtful and dan- 21
gerous to Bishops themselves, and make them as hurtful to others, are their 'offices,' and 'places in courts of judicature,' and their 'employment by obligation of office in civil affairs.' Where, first, for 'offices;' I know no bishop since the Reformation that hath been troubled with any, but only Dr. Juxon, when Bishop of London, was Lord High Treasurer of England for about five years[m]. And he was made when the King's affairs were in a great strait; and, to my knowledge, he carried so, that if he might have been left to himself, the King might have been preserved from most of those difficulties into which he after fell for want of money. As all kings shall be hazarded, more or less, in some time or other of their reign, and much the more if their purses be empty, and they forced to seek aid from their subjects. And this, as 'tis every where true, yet 'tis most true in England.

As for 'places in courts of judicature,' the Bishops of England have ever sat all of them in Parliament, the highest court, ever since Parliaments were in England. And whatsoever is now thought of them, they have in their several generations done great services there: and, as I conceive, it is not only fit, but necessary they should have votes in that great court; howsoever the late Act hath shut them out; and that Act must in time be repealed[n], or it shall undoubtedly be worse for this kingdom than yet it is. The Bishops sat in no other courts but the Star-Chamber and the High-Commission. And of these the High-Commission was most proper for them to sit, and see sin punished: for no causes were handled there but ecclesiastical, and those such as were very heinous, either for the crime itself, or the persons which committed it, being too great or too wilful to be ruled by the inferior jurisdictions. As for the Star-Chamber, there were ordinarily but two bishops present, and it was fit some should be there: for that court was a mixed court of law, equity, honour, and conscience, and was composed of persons accordingly, from the very original of that court. For there

[m] [He held the office from March 9, 163⅔, to May 17, 1641.]

[n] [It was repealed by 13 Car. II. cap. ii.]

were to be there two judges to take care of the laws, and two bishops to look to the conscience, and the rest men of great offices or birth, or both, to preserve the honour, and all of them together to maintain the equity of the court. So here were but two bishops employed, and those only twice a week in term time. As for the Council-table, that was never accounted a court, yet as matters civil were heard and often ended there, so were some ecclesiastical too. But the Bishops were little honoured with this trouble since the Reformation: for many times no bishop was of the Council-table, and usually not above two. Once in King James's time I knew three, and once four, and that was the highest [o], and but for a short time. And certainly the fewer the better, if this Lord can prove (that which he says he will insist upon) that those things are 'hurtful to themselves, and make them hurtful to others.' And to do this he proceeds:—

> *They themselves are hurt thereby in their conscience and in their credits. In their conscience, by seeking and admitting things which are inconsistent with that function and office which God hath set them apart unto.* [p. 2.]

His Lordship begins with this, 'that the Bishops are hereby hurt both in their consciences and their credits.' Two great hurts indeed, if by these things they be wounded in their consciences towards God, and in their credits before men. But I am willing to hope these are not real, but imaginary hurts, and that this Lord shall not be able to prove it otherwise: yet I see he is resolved to labour it as much as he can. And, first, he would prove that these things, and not the ambitious seeking of them only, but the very admitting of them, though offered, or in a manner laid upon some of them by the supreme power, are hurtful to their consciences, because they 'are inconsistent with the function to which God hath set them apart.' But I have proved already that they are not inconsistent with that function, and so there's an end of this argument. For Bishops, without neglect of their calling, may spend those few hours required of them, in

[o] [Archbishop Abbot, Bishops Montagu (of Winchester) and Andrewes, were Privy Councillors at one time.]

giving their assistance in and to the forenamed civil affairs. And 'tis well known that S. Augustin did both in great perfection, so high up in the primitive Church, and in that great and learned age: for he complains that he had nor forenoon nor afternoon free, he was so held to it, *occupationibus hominum*, by the businesses which men brought to him; and he desires that he may ease himself in part upon him that was at his desire designed his successor; to which the people expressed their great liking, by their acclamation[p]. And these businesses he despatched with that great dexterity to most men's content, that men did not only bring their secular causes before him, but were very desirous to have him determine them[q]. And S. Ambrose was in greater employment for secular affairs than S. Augustin was, for he was Bishop and Governor of Milan both at once; and was so full of this employment, that S. Augustin, being then upon the point of his conversion, complains he could not find him at so much leisure as he would[r]. And this, besides many bishops and clergymen of great note, who have been employed in great embassies, and great offices under emperors and kings, and discharged them with great fidelity and advantage to the public, and without detriment to the Church[s]. And surely they would never have taken this burden upon them, had their conscience been hurt by it, or had it been inconsistent with their function, or absolutely against the ancient canons of the Church, of which they were so conscientious and strict observers. My Lord goes on to another argument and tells us:—

[p] S. Aug. Ep. cx. [ccxiii. Ben. § 5. Op., tom. ii. col. 1198. B.]

[q] "Et homines quidam causas suas sæculares apud nos finire cupientes," &c.—S. Aug. Epist. cxlvii. [xxxiii. Ben. § 5. Op., tom. ii. col. 94. A.] and [S.] Amb. lib. v. Epist. xxxiii. [(Epist. lxxxii. Ben.) Op., tom. ii. col. 1100.]

[r] "Non enim quærere ab eo poteram quod volebam sicut volebam, secludentibus me ab ejus aure et ore catervis negotiosorum hominum, quorum infirmitatibus serviebat."—S. Aug. lib. vi. Confess. cap. 3. [Op., tom. i. col. 212. B.C.]

[s] Similiter Sozomen. refert de Epiphanio, lib. vi. Hist. cap. 3. [leg. 32. Ὡς ἐν ὁμίλῳ γὰρ καὶ πόλει μεγάλῃ καὶ παραλίῳ ἱερώμενος, καὶ μεθ' ὅσης ἀρετῆς εἶχε πολιτικοῖς ἐμβαλὼν πράγμασιν, ἀστικοῖς καὶ ξένοις παντοδαποῖς γνώριμος ἐν ὀλίγῳ ἐγένετο.]

Et de Jacobo quodam, Theod. lib. ii. Hist. cap. 30. [Theodoret speaks of the defence of Nisibis against Sapor by James, the Bishop of the place.]

Et de Chrysostomo, Socrat. lib. vii. Hist. c. 8. [Socrates in this passage speaks of Maruthas being sent as ambassador to the King of Persia, and does not make any mention of S. Chrysostom.]

Et Constantinus communicabat cum Episcopis consilia de expeditione sua contra Persas. Euseb. lib. i. de Vita Constant. cap. 35. [lib. i. cap. 42.]

They are separated unto a special work, and men must take heed how they misemploy things dedicated and set apart to the service of God. They are called to preach the Gospel, and set apart to the work of the ministry; and the Apostle saith, 'Who is sufficient for these things?' showing that this requireth the whole man: and all is too little. Therefore for them to seek or take other offices, which shall require and tie them to employ their time and studies in the affairs of this world, will draw a guilt upon them, as being inconsistent with that which God doth call them, and set them apart unto. [p. 2.]

This is my Lord's next argument. And truly I like the beginning of it very well, and I pray God this Lord may be mindful of it when time may serve; for surely men ought to take heed how they misemploy things dedicated and set apart to the service of God. And therefore, as ministers must not misemploy their persons or their times, which are dedicated to God and His service; no more must laymen take away and misemploy the Church revenues devoutly given, dedicated, and set apart to maintain and hold up the service of God, and to refresh Christ in his poor members upon earth. And if ever a scambling time come for the Church-lands (as these times hereafter must), I hope his Lordship will remember this argument of his, and help to hold back the violent from committing more sacrilege, whereas too much lies heavy on the kingdom already.

The rest of the argument will abide some examination. First, then, most true it is, that Bishops are 'called to preach the Gospel, and set apart to that work,' but whether they be so set apart, as that, what necessity soever requires it, they may do nothing else but study and preach, is no great question; for certainly, they may in times of persecution labour many ways for their preservation, and in times of want for their sustenance, and at all times (if they be called to it) give their best counsel and advice for the public safety of the State as well as their own.

Nor doth that of the Apostle, 2 Cor. ii. 16, 'Who is sufficient for these things?' hinder this at all; for though this great calling and charge 'requires the whole man,' though all

that the ablest man can do in it be 'too little' (all things simply and exactly considered), yet he that saith here, 'none are sufficient for these things,' (for so much the question implieth,) saith also in the very next chapter, that God hath made him and others 'able ministers of the New Testament,' 2 Cor. iii. 6, and if able, then doubtless sufficient. And the Greek word is the same, ἱκανος, 'sufficient,' in the one place, and ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς, 'made us sufficient,' in the other. Besides, it may be the sense of the places will bear it, that no man is sufficient for the dignity of the office, which brings with it the 'savour of life or death' to all men, and yet that many men are made sufficient by God's grace to perform this office; that is, to bring both the one and the other. But howsoever, be the office as high it is, and be the men never so sufficient, yet the function is such as cannot be daily performed by the priest for the preaching part, nor attended by the people for their other necessary employments of life, which made the wisdom of God Himself command a Sabbath under the Law, and the Church to settle the Lord's-day, and other holy-days 24 under the Gospel, for the public service and worship of God, and the instruction of the people. I say, in regard of this, a bishop or a priest who shall be judged fit for that public service, may give counsel in any civil affairs, and take upon him (if not seek) any office temporal that may help and assist him in his calling, and give him credit and countenance to do the more good among his people, but not to the desertion of his spiritual work. And this Lord is much deceived if he thinks all offices do require and tie them to employ their time and studies in the affairs of this world. If they be such offices as do, I grant with him, that to take them (unless it be upon some urgent necessity) may 'draw a guilt upon them:' but if they be such as clergymen may easily execute in their empty hours, without any great hindrance to their calling, and perhaps with great advantage to it, then, out of doubt, it can draw no guilt upon them which take them. And this Lord in this passage is very cunning: for, instead of speaking of Bishops having anything to do in civil affairs, he speaks of nothing but taking of offices. Now a clergyman may many ways have to do in temporal affairs, without taking any set office upon him, which shall not tie up his time or his studies

to the affairs of this world, as it seems this Lord would persuade the world all do.

Now, that a bishop or other clergyman may lawfully meddle with some temporal affairs, (always provided that he 'entangle[t]' not himself with them; for that indeed no man doth that wars for Christ as he ought, 2 Tim. ii. 4,) is, I think, very evident, not only by that which the priests did, and might do under the Law, but also by that which was done after Christ, in the Apostles' time, and by some of them. To study and practise physic is as much inconsistent with the function of a minister of the Gospel, as to sit, consult, and give counsel in civil affairs: but St. Luke, though an Evangelist, continued his profession, as appears, Coloss. iv. 14, where St. Paul says thus: 'Luke the beloved physician greets you;' where St. Paul would never have called him a 'physician' had he left off that calling to attend the Gospel only. And S. Paul himself, when he might have lived on the Gospel by the Lord's own ordinance, 1 Cor. ix., would never have betaken himself to live by 'making of tents,' Acts xviii., only for a convenience (as I conceive), that he might work the more upon the people while he charged them not, if in so doing he had found it a hindrance to his preaching the Gospel. And this Lord and others, who would not have ministers meddle with civil affairs, are content, not only to the disgrace of the ministry, but even of religion itself, to hear felt-makers, and ironmongers, and gardeners, and brewers, clerks, and coachmen preach God knows what stuff, and countenance them in this sacrilegious presumption. Nay, and are never troubled that these men have all their time taken up in the affairs of the world, but rather say their gifts are the greater, that they are able to do both. Out of doubt they hope that their coachmen-preachers shall hurry them to heaven in some fiery chariot; and I myself in time might be
25 brought to believe it too, did I not see Phaeton setting the Christian world on fire, but no Elias there. Nor yet will S. Paul's example any whit advantage them: for he was no ignorant tradesman, but a learned Pharisee brought up under Gamaliel, Acts xxii. And it was the custom of their doc-

[t] Ἐμπλέκεται, implicatur.

tors, (as it is at this day in Turkey, and many other places in the East,) to breed up their scholars to a trade as well as to the knowledge of their law; both that they might know the better how to spend their empty hours honestly, and be able to get their living should necessity overtake them. Now let these bold men show under what Gamaliel they were bred, and how they profited under him; or that they have S. Paul's revelation as well as his trade, and then I'll say more to them. But this Lord is very full in this theme, and falls upon another argument.

> *In this respect* (saith he) *our Saviour hath expressly prohibited it, telling His Apostles that they should not 'lord it over their brethren,' nor exercise jurisdiction over them, as was used in civil governments among the heathen. They were called Gracious Lords, and exercised jurisdiction, as lords, over others; and sure they might lawfully do so. But to the ministers of the Gospel our Saviour gives this rule: It shall not be so done to you; if you strive for greatness, he shall be greatest that is the greatest servant to the rest. Therefore in another place he saith, 'He that putteth his hand to the plough, and looketh back to the things of this world, is not fit for the kingdom of God;' that is, the preaching of the Gospel, as it is usually called.* [p. 2.]

This argument will be somewhat indeed, if it proves such as this Lord says it is. For he says that our Saviour hath expressly prohibited it: and if it be so, there's an end of the controversy. No question but it is utterly unlawful if our Saviour prohibited it. But where is it that He hath done so? Where? Why, 'tis where He tells His Apostles, that they should not 'lord it over their brethren.' Not lord it over their brethren? That's true. Nor exercise jurisdiction over them? That's false, if the proposition be general; for then there can be no order, no government among Churchmen. And if it be particular, no such jurisdiction as was used in civil government among the heathen, then 'tis fit to weigh this place through and throughout. Well then! the mother

of Zebedee's children desired of Christ for her two sons, that 'the one might sit at His right hand, and the other at His left hand in His kingdom;' S. Matth. xx. 21. Where, first, it appears plainly, that this was not only a piece of feminine ambition, for her sons made the suit as well as she; so S. Mark, x. 35, tells us: and they came with her when she made it; so S. Matth. xx. 20. And little doubt need be made but that they set their mother on to move it, as may appear partly by our Saviour, who says nothing to the mother, but first puts a question to the sons, which they answer, and then gives His answer to them, ver. 22, 23; which, I conceive, He would not have done, had not they been in the business: and partly, because the other ten disdained [u] at the two brethren for this, ver. 24. Secondly, if it were here meant by them, 'to sit at His right hand and at His left in His kingdom in heaven,' as may be thought not altogether improbable by the question Christ put to them about His baptism and His cup, both preparatory to that kingdom: and if it be so (and so some think it is), then this text is applied by this Lord to no purpose, if it meddles nothing with temporal offices and employments, but relates to the kingdom of heaven. But if they meant by this sitting at His right hand and at His left the honourable places about Him in His earthly kingdom, which the Apostles sometimes fancied He should here have, as some think, because of the other part of Christ's answer, that 'the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, but it shall not be so amongst you,' ver. 25, 26; then the answer is clear, that Christ did not here forbid them the taking of such places upon them simply, but He forbids either an absolute independent power,—for so *κατακυριεύειν* signifies, which takes not away superiority over others, so they be subject to the prince and state,—or else the using of such places after the lordly and tyrannous manner of some heathens. And the Geneva divines, in their notes upon the Bible, tell us, that the meaning of Christ's answer to them in these words, 'To sit at My right hand and at My left is not Mine to give,' ver. 23, is, that God the Father had not given Him charge to bestow offices of honour here, but to be an

[u] Or were moved with indignation, *ἠγανάκτησαν.*

example of humility to all[x]. So Christ came not then to give such places; but here's no prohibition for the Apostles to take them at their hands, who would give them for the good of the Church. And howsoever, if this place must be understood of temporal honours and employments, then it follows, that though these two Apostles had not those seats, some other of them should. For Christ says plainly, that the sitting at His right hand and at His left 'shall be given to them for whom it is prepared by His Father.' So then it shall be given to some, and doubtless to some of the Apostles: strangers should not be preferred before them. And 'tis all one to our present business, which of the Apostles sat there, so some did, or were to do; and rather than yield this, his Lordship perhaps were better grant that this is to be understood of another kingdom, and that this text meddles with no temporal either offices or employments, but that by occasion of this our Saviour preaches humility to them, yet so as still to keep up authority and government in the Church, to which He applies it.

And for that other parallel place, 'Be ye not called Rabbi,' S. Matth. xxiii. 8, that cannot prejudice all jurisdiction in men in holy orders; as if to meddle with it were forbidden by Christ, or, as if it were Antichristian, as now 'tis made; since it is plain that Christ there forbids neither the title, nor the preeminence, nor the authority, but the vain-glorious affectation of it, ver. 5, 6; and that's a sin indeed, no man doubts. And it may be observed, too, if this Lord pleases, that this precept was given to the people too, as well as to the disciples, ver. 1; and then, for aught I know, this truth will come in as strongly to pull down temporal Lords, as Bishops; and what will his Lordship say to that?

As for that which is added by this Lord, 'If ye strive for greatness, he shall be greatest who is the greatest servant to the rest:' though the words differ somewhat from the text, 27
yet my Lord must be content to hear that there is a twofold greatness; the one in God's account, and that's greatness indeed: and so our Saviour means it here, that 'he is greatest who is the greatest servant to the rest,' (if this Lord will

[x] Annot. in St. Matth. xx. 23.

needs read it so:) the other is in man's account, when one man hath power and superiority over another; and which was that which the Apostles affected. In which case, though our Saviour's precept be, 'Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your servant;' that is, the more serviceable to you and the Church, the greater he is; yet these words, 'it shall not be so with you,' do not deny this authority or greatness which one may have over another in the Church of Christ for the necessary government thereof, though they neither do nor may domineer over their brethren. And therefore where St. Matthew reads it, he that will be *μέγας*, 'great,' and *πρῶτος*, 'first,' among you [y]; there St. Luke [z] hath it, *ὁ μείζων*, 'greater,' and *ὁ ἡγούμενος*, 'chief' or 'leader [a].' Nor doth he say so as St. Matthew does, he that would be so, but, 'he that is,' which argues clearly, that even in our Saviour's own account and institution too, there was then, and should be after His ascension, 'greater' and 'less,' such as were to lead, and such as were to be led. No parity, and yet no barbarous lording; but orderly and Christian governing in the Church. And this must needs be so, or else Christ left His Church in a worse condition than this Lord acknowledges the civil governments were among the heathen, which he says might lawfully govern so. For I hope he will not say that even the heathen might tyrannise.

If this be not sufficient, this Lord puts us in mind that our Saviour says in another place, that 'he which lays his hand to the plough, and looks back to the things of this world, is not fit for the kingdom of God; that is, the preaching of the Gospel, as 'tis usually called,' St. Luke ix. *ult.* Where, first, it may be doubted whether this laying of the 'hand to the plough' belong to the ministers of the Gospel only, or to others also; for if it belongs to others as well as to them (though perhaps not so much), then no Christian, though he be not a minister, may have to do with worldly affairs; and then we shall have a devout wise world quickly. Secondly, it may be doubted, too, whether this 'looking back' be any kind of meddling at all with worldly affairs, or such a meddling as

[y] St. Matth. xx. 26, 27.
[z] St. Luke xxii. 26.
[a] And St. Paul uses it for a bishop or governor, Heb. xiii. 1.

shall so entangle the husbandman that his plough stands still, or so bewitches him that he forsakes his 'plough,' that is, his calling, altogether. If it be no meddling at all, no man can live; if it be no meddling but that which entangles, then any minister may meddle with worldly affairs, so far and so long as he 'entangles' not himself with them: and so far as to entangle himself, no Christian may meddle, 'that will live godly in Christ Jesus.'

If this be not sufficient, this Lord will prove it e'er he hath done, for he goes on:—

> *To be thus withdrawn, by entangling themselves with the affairs of this life, by the necessity and duty of an office received from men, from the discharge of that office which God hath called them to, brings a woe upon them. 'Woe unto me,' saith the Apostle, 'if I preach not the Gospel.'* 28 *What doth he mean? If I preach not once a quarter, or once a year in the King's Chapel? No. He himself interprets it, 'Preach the word, be instant in season and out of season; rebuke, exhort, or instruct with all long-suffering and doctrine.' He that hath an office must attend on his office, especially this of the ministry.* [pp. 2, 3.]

I see my Lord will not mend his terms, though they mar the sense, and mislay the question. For no man says that which this Lord so often repeats; namely, that a Bishop or any other clergyman may 'entangle himself with the affairs of this life' (which yet may be with covetousness and voluptuous living, as much or more than with being called to council in civil affairs) 'by any office received from man, from the discharge of that office which God hath called them unto.' No! God forbid! this would 'bring a woe upon them' indeed. But since no man says it, this Lord fights here with his own shadow. For all that is said is this, that a Bishop being grown old and full of experience, if the King, or the State in which he lives, thinks him for his wisdom, experience, and fidelity, fit to be employed in civil councils or affairs, be it with an office or without, the Bishop may lawfully undertake this, so he be able to discharge it without

deserting the office which God and His Church have laid upon him. But if he takes it, and be not able to discharge both; or being able, doth loiter and not discharge them; either of these is *vitium hominis*, the fault of the person, but the thing is lawful.

As for the place of Scripture which his Lordship adds; I doubt his Lordship understands it not as the Apostle means it; for 'tis a text very much abused by ignorant zeal. For when he saith, 'Woe unto me if I preach not the Gospel,' 1 Cor. ix. 16, 'what doth he mean? if he preach not once a quarter?' No sure, that's too seldom. What then? if he preach not 'once a year in the King's Chapel?' No sure, much less. For in those days there was no king in Corinth, nor anywhere else, that was Christian, to have a chapel to preach in. So this Lord might have let this scorn alone, had it so pleased him. No; nor is it if a man prate not three or four times a week in one of his Lordship's Independent congregations, and then call it preaching. The Apostle knew no such schismatical conventicles. No sure, none of this. Why, but what is this preaching, then, the neglect whereof draws this 'woe' after it? This he tells you St. Paul interprets himself, 2 Tim. iv. 2, 'tis to 'preach the word.' 'Tis indeed, and neither schism nor sedition, which are the common themes of these times. 'Tis to be 'instant in preaching the word,' as God gives ability and opportunity; 'tis to be 'instant in season and out of season;' that is, to take God's opportunity rather than our own, and not preach out of season only, as some of this Lord's great favourites use to do; 'tis to 'rebuke, exhort, and instruct,' with knowledge and gravity, and not spend hours in idle and empty discourses. And all this is to be done 'with all long-suffering and doctrine;' and let the clergy but study hard, and provide that their doctrine be sound and good, and I will pass my word this Lord and his friends shall take order they shall do it with all the 'long-suffering' that may be; and if they do not suffer enough, or not long enough, it shall not be his fault, so dearly doth he love that they should preach the word.

Nay, I must go further yet. To 'preach the word' in this manner, is not only to go up into the pulpit, and thence

deliver wholesome and pious instructions, and necessary and Christian reproof, though this be, as the commendable, so the ordinary way of public preaching, that most at once may hear. For he may be said to preach the Gospel that any ways declares 'Christ crucified,' and informs the understandings and consciences of men, for right belief and true obedience, be it privately or publicly; be it by word of mouth or by writing: and a man may be seasonably instant this way sometimes, when in the public way of preaching he cannot. And if this be not so, how is it said of the Apostles, Acts v. 42, that 'in the temple and in every house, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus Christ?' Acts xx. 20, 'I have taught you publicly, and from house to house.' And I believe some Bishops, whom this Lord in this passage is pleased to jeer at, have preached more and to more purpose than any of his Lordship's Divinity-darlings. That which follows is true, that he which hath an office, 'must wait upon his office,' Rom. xii. 7, and 'especially this of the ministry;' of which office there the Apostle principally treats. But this again no man denies. And yet by his Lordship's good leave, no man is bound to starve by waiting upon his office. He must wait upon it, that's true; but he must provide necessaries too, that he may be able to wait. Next, this Lord tells us:—

> *The practice of the Apostles is answerable to the direction and doctrine of our Saviour. There never was, nor will be, men of so great abilities and gifts as they were endued withal, yet they thought it so inconsistent with their calling, to take places of judicature in civil matters and secular affairs and employment upon them, that they would not admit of the care and distraction that a business far more agreeable to their callings than these would cast upon them, and they give the reason of it in the sixth of the Acts, ver. 2, 'It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables.'* [p. 3.]

There is no doubt but that 'the practice of the Apostles was answerable to the direction and doctrine of our Saviour.' And as certainly true it is, that 'there never were, nor ever will be, men of so great abilities and gifts,' in supernatural

and heavenly things especially, 'as they were endued withal.' But how will this Lord prove that they thought it a thing absolutely 'inconsistent with their calling' to meddle with temporal or civil affairs. No one of them hath in any place of Scripture expressed so much. Against 'entangling' themselves with the world and the affairs of it, I confess they have, but no more. Yet this Lord proves it thus: 'They would not admit of the care and distraction that a business far more agreeable to their calling than these would cast upon them.' His Lordship means the Deacon's office. And therefore surely they would not take these. But this argument, by his Lordship's leave, is inconsequent. For if any offices or employments, how agreeable soever to their calling, bring with them such 'care and distraction' as shall in a manner quite take them off from preaching the Gospel, the Apostles did not, and their successors may not trouble themselves with them. When as yet the Apostles might, and their successors may take on them other employments, though in their nature less agreeable to their calling, if they be less distractive from it. Now the Deacon's office (as it was then) brought more trouble upon them for the poor and the widows, than any places of judicature or council do upon clergymen now. Which may appear by the very reason they have given, and here remembered, that 'it was no reason they should leave the word of God and serve tables.' For there it is not said, that they might not at all meddle with the ordering of those tables, but that it was not fit they should so meddle with them as καταλείψαντας—leaving the word of God to attend them. And this to do, no man says is lawful now. But his Lordship presses this argument yet further:—

And again, when they had appointed them to choose men fit for that business, they institute an office rather, for taking care of the poor, than they by it would be distracted from the principal work of their calling, and then show how they ought to apply themselves: 'But we,' say they, 'will give ourselves continually unto prayer, and to the ministry of the word.' Did the Apostles, men of extraordinary gifts, think it unreasonable for them to be hindered from giving themselves continually to preaching the word and

prayer, by taking care for the tables of poor widows; and can Bishops now think it reasonable or lawful for them to contend for sitting at Council-tables, to govern states, to turn statesmen instead of Churchmen, to sit in the highest courts of judicature, and to be employed in making laws for civil polities and government? [p. 3.]

It is true, indeed, that the Apostles appointed the disciples to choose men fit for that business, and that they did institute the office of Deacons, to take care of the poor, rather than they would be distracted from the principal work of their calling. But when was this done? When? Why, not till the disciples were multiplied; not till there arose contentions between 'the Greeks and the Hebrews, that their widows were neglected in the daily ministration,' Acts vi. 1. Therefore, till the work grew so heavy, and the contentions so warm, the Apostles themselves did order those tables, and attend them too. Therefore, the work was not unlawful in itself for them, for then it had been sin in them to do it at all at any time. For that which is simply evil in, and of itself, is ever so; therefore the most that can be made of this example is, that it was lawful, very lawful and charitable too, for the Apostles to take care of those tables themselves; and they did it. For all the provision for the poor was brought and 'laid at the Apostles' feet,' Acts iv. 35, which doubtless would never have been done, had it been unlawful for the Apostles to order and to distribute it. But when they found the increasing burden too heavy for both the one work and the other, then, though both were lawful, yet it was more 31
expedient to leave the tables than the word of God, with which the world was then as little acquainted, as now 'tis full of; (and I pray God it be not full to a dangerous surfeit.) Now this, as I conceive in humility, states the Bishops' business: for to me it seems out of question, that it is most lawful for Bishops to be conversant in all the courts, councils, and places of judicature, to which they have been called since the Reformation in the Church and State of England, till they find themselves, or be found unable to discharge the one duty and the other. And then, indeed, I grant no serving of tables, no nor Council-tables is to be preferred. But then

you must not measure preaching only by a formal going up into the pulpit: for a Bishop (and such occasions are often offered) may preach the Gospel more publicly and to far greater edification in a court of judicature, or at a Council-table, where great men are met together to draw things to an issue, than many preachers in their several charges can; and therefore to far more advancement of the Gospel, than any one of his Lordship's sect at a table's end in his Lordship's parlour, or in a pulpit in his Independent congregation, wheresoever it be. And when he hath said all that he can, or any man else, this shall be found true, that there is not the like necessity of preaching the Gospel lying upon every man in Holy Orders, now Christianity is spread and hath taken root, as lay upon the Apostles and apostolical men, when Christ and His religion were strangers to the whole world. And yet I speak not this to cast a damp or chillness upon any man's zeal or diligence in that work. No, God forbid! For, though I conceive there is not the same necessity, yet a great necessity there is still, and ever will be, to hold up both the verity and devotion which attend religion; and—*Non minor est virtus, quam quærere, parta tueri.* So there may be as great virtue in the action, though perhaps not equal necessity of it.

Besides, Deacons were not laymen, but men in Holy Orders, though inferior to the Apostles; as appears by Stephen's undertaking the Libertines and Cyrenians in the cause of Christ; and Philip's preaching of Christ in Samaria, and baptizing[b]. And if they were of the Seventy (as Epiphanius thinks they were, Hær. [xx.])[c], then they were presbyters before they had this temporary office (if such it were) put upon them. Therefore, if to meddle with these things were simply unlawful in themselves, or for men in holy orders; or, if all meddling with them were such a distraction as must needs make them leave the preaching of the Gospel; then these Seventy might not discharge the office to which they were chosen. And if this be so, then this Lord must needs infer that the Apostles, and all which chose them, did sin in instituting such men to take care of the tables, and to

[b] Acts vi. 9; Acts viii. 5, 38; Acts vi. 6.

[c] [S. Epiph. Hær. xx. § 4. p. 50.]

distract them from preaching of the word, which they thought unfit for themselves to do. And yet, I hope, my Lord will not say this in his privatest conventicle. Nay, yet more; though this care was delivered over to the deacons in ordinary, yet Calvin tells us plainly, that in things of moment they could do nothing—*nec quicquam*—without the authority of the presbyters[d]. So they meddled still.

Next this Lord shows, since the Apostles did not think fit 32
to distract themselves with business about these tables, how they ought to apply themselves. And this he sets down in the Apostles' words, Acts vi. 4: 'But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and the ministry of the word.' And yet I hope this Lord doth not think the Apostles by this word 'continually,' meant to do nothing else but pray and preach; for if they did one of these two 'continually' without any intermission, then they could do nothing else; which is most apparently false. And, indeed, (which it seems this learned Lord considered not,) this word 'continually' is not in the text; for in the Greek the word is προσκαρτερήσομεν, 'we will be constant and instant in prayer and ministration of the word;' which may and ought to be done, though neither of them 'continually;' and which many of God's servants have done, and yet meddled some way or other with temporal or worldly affairs.

The argument is over: the rest of this passage is this Lord's rhetoric, which I shall answer as I repeat it. 'Did the Apostles,' saith his Lordship, 'men of extraordinary gifts, think it unreasonable for them to be hindered from giving themselves continually to preaching the word and prayer, by taking care of the tables of the poor widows?' No; sure they did not think it 'unreasonable;' that is this Lord's word, to make the present business of the Bishops more odious, as if it were against common reason. But there's no such word in the text. The word is, οὐκ ἀρεστὸν, 'it is not meet.' Now, many things may not be meet or comely, which yet are not altogether unreasonable; nay, which at some times, and upon some occasions, may be meet and comely enough; nay, perhaps necessary for the

[d] ["Sic mensis præfuisse diaconos, ut presbyteris tamen subessent, nec quicquam nisi ex eorum auctoritate agerent."]—Calv. in Acts xi. [30, p. 106.]

very Gospel itself, and therefore no way unreasonable; howsoever at this time unfit for the Apostles, and worthily refused by them.

Well, the rhetoric goes on. Did the Apostles thus, 'and can the Bishops now think it reasonable or lawful for them?' Yes; the times and circumstances being varied, and many things become fit which in some former times were not, they can think it both reasonable and lawful, nay, necessary for some of them. What? To contend for sitting at council-tables? No, God forbid: perhaps not to sue for sitting there, but certainly not to contend for it: but to sit there, being called unto it, and to give their best advice there, never unlawful, and ofttimes necessary. And here let me tell this Lord by the way, that the Bishop which he hath sufficiently hated, was so far from contending for this, that though he had that honour given him by his Majesty to sit there many years, yet I do here take it upon my Christianity and truth, that he did never move his Majesty, directly or indirectly, for that honour, and was surprised with it as altogether unlooked for, when his Majesty's resolution therein was made known unto him[e]. Nor ever did that Bishop take so much upon him as a justiceship of the peace, or meddle with any lay employment, save what the laws and customs of this realm laid upon him in the High-Commission and the Star-Chamber, while those courts were in being; and continued preaching till he was threescore and four, and then was taken off by writing of his book against Fisher the Jesuit, being then not able at those years to continue both.
3 And soon after the world knows what trouble befel him, and in time they will know why too, I hope. Besides, the care of government, which is another part of a Bishop's office, and a necessary one too, lay heavy upon him, in these factious and broken times especially. And whatsoever this Lord thinks of it, certainly, though preaching may be more necessary for the first planting of a Church, yet government is more noble and necessary too, where a Church is planted; as being that which must keep preaching and all things else in order. And preaching (as 'tis now used) hath as much need to be

[e] [Laud was appointed Privy Councillor April 29, 1627. See Diary at that date.]

kept in order as any, even the greatest extravagance that I know. Nor is this out of Christ's commission, *Pasce oves*, John xxi. 15, for the feeding of His sheep. For a shepherd must guide, govern, and defend his sheep in the pasture, as well as drive them to it. And he must see that their pasture be not tainted too, or else they will not thrive upon it. And then he may be answerable for the rot that falls among them.

The rhetoric goes further yet. 'To contend for sitting at council-tables to govern states.' No; but yet to assist them, being called by them. 'To have statesmen, instead of Churchmen.' No; but doing the duty of Churchmen, to mingle pious counsels with statesmen's wisdom. 'To sit in the highest courts of judicature.' And why not, in a kingdom where the laws and customs require it? 'Not to be employed in making laws for civil polities and government.' And I conceive there is great reason for this in the kingdom of England, and greater since the Reformation than before. Great reason, because the Bishops of England have been accounted, and truly been, grave and experienced men, and far fitter to have votes in Parliaments for the making of laws, than many young youths which are in either House. And because it is most fit, in the making of laws for a kingdom, that some divines should have vote and interest to see (as much as in them lies) that no law pass, which may perhaps, though unseen to others, intrench upon religion itself, or the Church. And I make no doubt but that these and the like considerations settled it so in England, where Bishops have had their votes in Parliaments, and in making laws, ever since there were Parliaments, yea, or anything that resembled them, in this kingdom. And for my part, were I able to give no reason at all why Bishops should have votes in Parliament, yet I should in all humility think that there was and is still some great reason for it, since the wisdom of the State hath successively in so many ages thought it fit. And as there is great reason they should have votes in making laws, so is there greater reason for it since the Reformation than before. For before that time clergymen were governed by the Church canons and constitutions, and the common laws of England had but little power over them. Then in

the year 1532 the clergy submitted, and an Act of Parliament was made upon it; so that ever since the clergy of England, from the highest to the lowest, are as much subject to the temporal laws as any other men, and therefore ought to have as free a vote and consent to the laws which bind them, as other subjects have. Yet so it is, that all clergymen are, and have long since been, excluded from being members of the House of Commons; and now the Bishops and their votes, by this last Act, are cast out of the Lords' House. By which it is at this day come to pass, that by the justice of England, as now it stands, no clergyman hath a consent, by himself or his proxy, to those laws to which all of them are bound.

In the meantime, before I pass from this point, this Lord must give me leave to put him in mind of that which was openly spoken in both Houses: that the reason why there was such a clamour against the Bishops' votes was, 'because all or most of them voted for the King,' so that the potent faction could not carry what they pleased, especially in the Upper House. And when some saw they could not have their will to cast out their votes fairly, the rabble must come down again, and clamour against their votes; not without danger to some of their persons. And come they did in multitudes. But who procured their coming I know not, unless it were this Lord and his followers. And notwithstanding this is as clear as the sun, and was openly spoken in the House, that this was the true cause only why they were so angry with the Bishops' votes; yet this most godly and religious Lord pretends here a far better cause than this; namely, that they may, as they ought, carefully attend to the preaching of the word, and not be distracted from that great work by being troubled with these worldly affairs. And I make no doubt, but that the same zeal will carry the same men to the devout taking away the Bishops' and the Church lands, and perhaps the parsons' tithes too, and put them to such stipends as they shall think fit, that so they may preach the Gospel freely, and not be drawn away with these worldly affairs from the principal work of that function. Well! my Lord must give me leave here to prophesy a little: and 'tis but this, in short; Either the Bishops shall in few years

recover of this hoarseness, and have their honour and their votes in Parliament again; or, before many years be past, all baseness, barbarity, and confusion, will go near to possess both this Church and kingdom.

But this Lord hath yet somewhat more to say; namely, that

> *If they shall be thought fit to sit in such places, and will undertake such employments, they must not be there as ignorant men, but must be knowing in business of state, and understand the rules and laws of government; and thereby both their time and studies must be necessarily diverted from that which God hath called them unto. And this surely is much more unlawful for them to admit of, than that which the Apostles rejected as a distraction unreasonable for them to be interrupted by.* [p. 3.]

Why, but yet, 'if they shall be thought fit to sit in such places, and will undertake such employments,' what then? Why, then, 'they must not sit there as ignorant men,' but they must be knowing men, 'and understand the rules and laws of government.' This is most true; and if any man sit in those places as an ignorant, 'tis an ill choice that is made of him, and he doth not well that accepts them. But sure, if Bishops sit there as ignorants, they are much to be blamed. For if they spend their younger studies, before they meddle with divinity, as they may and ought, sure there is some 35
great defect in them, if they be not as knowing men in the rules of government as most noblemen or others are, who spend all their younger time in hawking and hunting, and somewhat else. And this younger time of theirs, if Bishops have spent as they ought, they may, with a little care and observation, and without any great diversion of their time and studies from that which God hath called them unto, perform those places with great knowledge, and much happiness to the states in which they serve, as hath formerly in this, and doth at present in other neighbouring states, appear. And for aught this Lord knows, if some counsels had been followed, which some Bishops gave, neither the King, nor the State, nor the Church, had been in that ill condition in which they now are. Nor are these places 'more unlawful

for Bishops to admit of' in these times and conditions of the Church, 'than that which the Apostles rejected as a distraction,' but not as an 'unreasonable' one, in those times and beginnings of Christianity, as is proved before. But the zeal of this Lord burns still; and as it hath fired him already out of the Church, and made him a Separatist; so it would now fire the Bishops out of the State, and make them members of Antichrist. His Lordship goes on, therefore, and as before he told us the practice of the Apostles was answerable to the doctrine of Christ, so here he tells us again;—

> *The doctrine of the Apostles is agreeable to their practice herein. For St. Paul, when he instructeth Timothy for the work of the ministry, presseth this argument from the example of a good soldier: 'No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of the world.'* [p. 4.]

'The doctrine of the Apostles is agreeable indeed to their practice herein,' and in all things else; and I would to God with all my heart this Lord's opinions were agreeable to either their practice or their doctrine; and then, I am sure, he would be a better soldier for Christ than this poor Church hath cause to believe he is. But his Lordship says that 'Paul, when he instructs Timothy for the work of the ministry, presseth this argument from the example of a good soldier: That no man that warreth, ἐμπλέκεται, entangles himself with the affairs of the world[f].' The word ἐμπλέκω signifies *involvere et permiscere se*, to involve and, as it were, thoroughly to mingle himself with that which he undertakes; to be so busied, *ut extricare se non possit*, that he cannot untwist himself out of the employment. And I easily grant that no good Christian, much less any good Bishop, may so entangle himself with the world, as either to desert his calling, or to be so distracted from it, as not to do his duty in it. But this bars not all meddling with it. For the Geneva note upon that place says plainly, he may not entangle himself; no, not so much as with his household and other ordinary affairs[g]. But then if he shall not meddle with, or take care of these at all, he may beg or starve, unless he have better means than the competency which this devout age

[f] 2 Tim. ii. 4. [g] Annot. ibid.

[illegible] sufficient for the ministry. Nay, which is more, he may [illegible] under that heavy sentence of the Apostle, 1 Tim. v. 8. 'That if he provide not for his own, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than are infidels.' Nay, which is yet more, if all meddling with temporal affairs, all care of the world, be an 'entanglement,' the clergy must needs be in a perplexity whatsoever they do. For if they meddle with any worldly business, and entangle themselves, they do that they ought not, 2 Tim. ii. 4. And if they do not meddle with worldly affairs, and so do not provide for their own,—and provide they cannot without some meddling,—then, for fear of this Lord's sour divinity, that all meddling with is 'entangling' in them, they are 'worse than infidels.' Now a perplexity which shall wrap a man up in sin, which way soever he sets himself to action, is so contrary to divine justice, as that no law or scripture of God can command it, nor any right reason of man approve it.

But examining this text further, I find two things more observable. The one, that the 'soldier' here, whose example is the ground of this argument, is not bound under pain of any sin, not to busy himself with the affairs of this life; but he doth it not (saith the text) to the end 'he may please him whose soldier he is.' So then, if any man, the better to please God, forbears this employment, and his conscience and love to his calling be his motives so to do, he does well. But if another man, who hath no scruple in himself, and finds he can do both without an 'entanglement' by the one to the prejudice of the other, and thereupon be so employed, (for aught I know) he doth not sin. The other is, perhaps this Lord may find that St. Paul here in this place instructs Timothy, not so much for the work of the ministry, (as here he affirms,) as for the general work of Christianity. For, ver. 1, he exhorts to constancy and perseverance, that he 'be strong in the grace which is in Jesus Christ.' And then this argument falls upon other Christians as well as upon ministers, though not so much. And then I hope this Lord, who is so careful for our spiritual warfare, will take some care of his own also; if the great care which he takes at this present for the militia of the kingdom entangles him not. But his Lordship is now come to conclude this point;—

I conclude; That which by the commandment of our Saviour, by the practice and doctrine of the Apostles, and I may add, by the Canons of ancient Councils grounded thereupon, is prohibited to ministers of the Gospel, and showed to be such a distraction unto them from their calling and function, as will bring a woe upon them, and is not reasonable for them to admit of; if they shall notwithstanding entangle themselves withal, and enter into, it will bring a guilt upon their souls, and hurt them in respect of their consciences. [p. 4.]

His Lordship is now come (so he tells us) to conclude this point; and in this conclusion he artificially sums up, and briefly, all his arguments. I shall as briefly touch at my answers before given, and stay upon nothing, unless I find somewhat new. This done, I shall wait upon him (for that's his desire clergymen should) to the next point.

And truly, I find nothing new in the folding up this conclusion, but that he says he may add that ministers are prohibited from meddling with worldly affairs, 'by the Canons of ancient Councils grounded upon the Apostles' doctrine.' The Church is much beholding to this Lord that he will vouchsafe to name her ancient Councils: he doth not use to commit this fault often; and yet lest he should sin too much in this kind, he doth but tell you that he may add these, but he adds them not. It may be he doubts, that if he should name those Canons, some sufficient answer might be given them, and yet the truth remain firm, that it is not only lawful, but fit and expedient in some times and cases, for Bishops to intermeddle with, and give counsel in temporal affairs; and though this Lord names none, yet I will produce and examine such Canons and ancient Councils as I find, and see what they say in this business.

The first I meet withal is—but here I find myself met with, and prevented too, by a book entituled, 'Episcopacy asserted,' made by a Chaplain of mine, Mr. Jer. Taylor, who hath learnedly looked into and answered such Canons of Councils as are most quick upon Bishops or other clergymen for meddling much in temporal affairs[h]. And therefore

[h] Episcopacy asserted, § 49. [Works, vol. v. pp. 207—218.]

thither I refer the reader, being not willing to trouble him with saying over another man's lesson; only I shall examine such Councils (if any I find) which my Chaplain hath not met with, or omitted. And the last that I meet with is the Council of Sardis[i]; which, though the last, is as high up in the Church as about the year 347. And there was a Canon to restrain prelates from their frequent resorts to the court: yet there are many cases left at large in which they are permitted to use their own judgment and freedom. So that Canon seems to bring along with it rather counsel than command. And howsoever, they are well left to their liberty (as I conceive it), because to frequent the court, as overloving the place, is one thing; and to go thither, though often, when good cause calls for them (be that cause spiritual or temporal), is far from an offence. For if it be spiritual, they must go; that's their office and duty directly: and I see no reason why the physicians should be forbid to visit the places of greatest sickness. This I am sure of, Constantine the Great commanded the personal attendance of Bishops and other clergymen in his court[j]. And if it be temporal, they may go: that's their duty by consequence, especially, if they be called. For as their exemplary piety may move much, so do I not yet know any designs of state which are made the worse by religion; or any counsels of Princes hurt by being communicated with Bishops, in whom doth, or should, reside the care of religion and religious conversation. But perchance I have known some counsels miscarry for want of this.

The next is the first Council at Carthage, and there the prohibition runs thus: 'They which are of the Clergy, *non accedant ad actus seu administrationem, vel procurationem domorum*[k];' which forbids (as I conceive it) this only, that they should not be stewards of the houses or bailiffs of the lands of great persons. And this may be both in regard of

[i] Conc. Sardicens. edit. Lat. apud Binn. tom. i. par. 1. p. 431. [Εἰ τοίνυν, ἀγαπητοὶ ἀδελφοί, πᾶσι τοῦτο δοκεῖ, ἐπικρίνατε μηδένα ἐπίσκοπον χρῆναι εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον παραγίνεσθαι, παρεκτὸς τούτων, οὓς ἂν ὁ εὐλαβέστατος βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ γράμμασι μετακάλοιτο . . . ἀπεκρίναντο ἅπαντες· Ὁριζέσθω καὶ τοῦτο.—Conc. Sard. Can. vii.—Conc. tom. ii. col. 633. B. C.]

[j] [Ἐπήγετο δ' αὐτοὺς, καὶ ὅποι ποτε στέλλοιτο πορείαν.]—Euseb. de Vita Constant. lib. i. c. 35. [lib. i. cap. 45. p. 522.]

[k] Conc. Carthag. I. Can. vi. [Conc. tom. i. col. 616. A.]

the great trouble belonging to such places, and the hazard of scandal which might arise, in case there should happen any
8 failure in such great accounts. And in the Code of the African Councils it is thus read: *Non sint conductores et procuratores, nec ullo turpi et inhonesto negotio, victum quærant*[1]: which I think is the truer reading. And then this Council doth not forbid all meddling in secular affairs, but such as by their dishonest gain draw scandal upon the Church: and there is great reason such should be forbidden them.

A third I meet withal, and that is the Council of Eliberis, about the year of our Lord 306, where the Canon seems to be very strict against clergymen's going to markets and fairs *negotiandi causa*, to make profit by negotiation; but require them to send their son, their friend, or their servant to do such business for them[m]. And yet this prohibition, as strict as it seems, is not absolute, nor binding, further than that they shall not pursue those matters of gain out of their own provinces; but if they will and think fit, they might for all this Canon negotiate, either for their necessary maintenance or improvement of their fortunes, so that they wandered not abroad out of their own province where they serve.

In the meantime when all these, or any other Councils, are duly weighed, and their meaning right taken, this will be the result of all; that neither Bishop nor other clergyman might or may, by the Canons of Holy Church, ambitiously seek, or voluntarily of himself assume any secular engagement. And as they might not ambitiously seek great temporal employments, so might they not undertake any low or base ones for sordid and covetous ends. Nor might they relinquish their own charge to spend their strength in the assistance of a foreign one. But though they might not seek or voluntarily assume secular employment, yet they might

[1] Ὁμοίως ἤρεσεν, ἵνα ἐπίσκοποι καὶ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι ἐκλήπτορες μὴ γίνωνται, ἢ προκουράτωρες, μηδὲ ἔκ τινος αἰσχροῦ ἢ ἀτίμου πράγματος τροφὴν πορίζωνται.] — Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric. Can. xvi. [Conc. tom. ii. col. 1058. B.]

[m] Episcopi, presbyteri et diaconi de locis suis negotiandi causa non discedant, nec circumeuntes provincias quæstuosas nundinas sectentur. Sane ad victum suum [*leg.* sibi] conquirendum, aut filium, aut libertum, aut mercenarium, aut amicum, aut quemlibet mittant: et si voluerint negotiari, intra provinciam negotientur."— Conc. Eliberit. Can. xviii. [Conc. tom. i. col. 972. E.]

do any lawful thing imposed on them by their superiors[n]. And so might the Bishop (who had no superior in his province), if the Prince required his service; or that he thought it necessary for the present state of the Church in which he lived: for if he might transmit his power to those of the inferior clergy[o], no doubt but he might deal himself in such civil affairs as are agreeable to the dignity of his place and calling: and generally the Bishop, or any other clergyman, may and might by the ancient Canons of the Church be employed in any action of piety, though that action be attended with secular care and trouble. And this is without any strain at all collected out of that great and famous Council of Chalcedon, one of the four first General Councils, approved of highly throughout all Christendom, and with great reverence acknowledged in the laws of this kingdom. And therefore after the Canon of that Council had laid it down in general terms, that neither bishop, clerk, nor monk should farm grounds, or *immiscere se*, mix himself as it were, with such temporal affairs, it adds some exceptions of like nature to those by me expressed, especially the last of them[p]. And some of these will expound the canon of any Council 39
which I have yet seen, that speaks most against clergymen embarking themselves in secular business. And therefore though this Lord would not, yet I have laid before you whatsoever is come to my knowledge out of the 'ancient Councils;' where by this last cited and great Council, his Lordship may see, that Bishops should meddle with and order some temporal affairs, as persons in that kind fitter to be trusted than other

[n] *Ὥρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος, μήδενα τοῦ λοιποῦ, μὴ ἐπίσκοπον, μὴ κληρικόν, μὴ μονάζοντα, ἢ μισθοῦσθαι κτήματα, ἢ πράγματα, ἢ ἐπεισάγειν ἑαυτὸν κοσμικαῖς διοικήσεσι· πλὴν εἰ μή που ἐκ νομῶν καλοῖτο εἰς ἀφηλίκων ἀπαραίτητον ἐπιτροπὴν, ἢ ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἐπίσκοπος ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἐπιτρέψοι φροντίζειν πραγμάτων, ἢ ὀρφανῶν καὶ χηρῶν ἀπρονοήτων, καὶ τῶν προσώπων τῶν μάλιστα τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς δεομένων βοηθείας, διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ Κυρίου.*]—"Aut negotiis sæcularibus se immiscere, præter pupillorum si forte leges imponant inexcusabilem curam, aut civitatis episcopus ecclesiasticarum rerum solicitudinem habere præcipiat, aut orphanorum et viduarum, eorum qui sine ulla defensione sunt, ac personarum quæ maxime indigent ecclesiastico adjutorio, et propter timorem Domini causa deposcat."—Conc. Chalced. Act. xv. Can. iii. [Conc. tom. iv. coll. 755. E., 758. A. The Latin version is that of Dionysius Exiguus. See ibid. col. 773. C.]

[o] [*Ὥστε συναγὼν εἰπὲ, ὅτι πάντες οἱ τῷ κανόνι περιεχόμενοι, κατ' ἐπιτροπὴν ἐπισκοπικὴν οὐ μόνον ἐκκλησιαστικὰ πράγματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολιτικὰ ἐνεργήσουσιν ἀποκριματίστως, κ.τ.λ.*]—Balsamon. in Concil. Chalcedon. c. iii. p. 27. [Beveregii Pand. Can. tom. i. p. 114. C.]

[p] [See note [n].]

men of what rank or condition soever; and therefore excepts from its own general Canon the cases of orphans and widows, and the estates of such persons as most need ecclesiastical help, or where any cause in the fear of God requires it. In which cases the widows and the fatherless have had much cause to bless God, when they have been referred to the conscience, trust, and care of Bishops. But this were in a manner to make them masters of the wards or guardians to them, which I know this Lord will not like by any means. It would come too near his office[q]; and then he would cry out indeed, that this was a greater distraction of them from their function to which God had called them, than that of the attending poor 'widows' tables' was to the Apostles: and yet he sees what some Canons of ancient Councils have decreed in this case. Besides, we cannot have a better or a clearer evidence of the true meaning of the ancient Canons, than from the practice of the ancient Fathers of the Church, who were strict and conscientious observers of the Canons, and yet (as is before proved) meddled in many, and some the greatest civil affairs, being employed as ambassadors from great emperors and kings: and Balsamon observes, that whensoever it shall please the Prince to call any Bishops to such employments, they neither are to be restrained by the aforesaid Canons, nor censured by them[r].

I conclude this point then, that Bishops are not prohibited to meddle with civil public affairs, either by Christ's command or by the Apostles' either doctrine or practice, (though all their practice doth not give an absolute rule for all future obedience, as their doctrine doth;) and I may add, not by Canons of ancient Councils (rightly understood); nor are all of them such distractions 'as will bring a woe' upon Bishops or other clergymen, though they meddle with them. I rather believe some things will be in a woful case if they meddle not. And in some cases there's all the reason in the world they should be not only permitted, but some of them

[q] [See above, p. 95.]

[r] [Λέγουσι δέ τινες, χώραν ταῦτα ἔχειν, ὅταν δίχα προστάξεως βασιλικῆς ἐνεργῇ τις ἱερώμενος δουλείαν δημοσιακήν· εἰ γὰρ κατ' οἰκονομίαν βασιλικὴν τοιαύτην τινὰ δουλείαν ἀναδέξεταί τις, ὑπὸ τῶν ῥηθέντων κανόνων οὐ κωλυθήσεται, οὐδὲ βλαβήσεται. καὶ προστιθέασιν, ὡς ὁ βασιλεὺς οὔτε νόμοις οὔτε κανόσιν ὑπόκειται.] —Balsam. in Conc. Carthag. prima, Can. xvi. pp. 328, 329. [Beveregii Pand. Can. tom. i. p. 538. F.]

commanded to meddle; to the end that in all consultations, especially the greatest, in Parliament, and at Council-table, it might be their care to see that religion were kept upright in all; and that nothing by practice or otherwise pass, *cum detrimento religionis et Ecclesiæ*, 'with detriment to religion or the Church,' always provided that they do not so entangle themselves in any of these affairs, as shall much prejudice their function; and this done, I know no guilt that this meddling can bring upon their souls, or hurt their consciences. But this Lord having (as he thinks) concluded the contrary, proceeds now to the next point, and says, that—

> *In the next place, this meddling in temporal affairs doth blemish them, and strike them in their credit; so far from truth is that position which they desire to possess the world withal, that unless they may have those outward trappings, or worldly pomp added to the ministry, that calling will grow into contempt and be despised.* [p. 4.]

Good God! How pious this Lord is, and what a careful friend over the Church! First, he takes care the Bishops' consciences may not be hurt, and now he is as jealous over their credits. But I doubt he is jealous over them amiss. For he is of opinion, that meddling in civil affairs strikes them in their credit; and he thinks further, that the position with which they would possess the world in this case is far from truth. Let's examine this position then, what it is, and what it works. The position is (as this Lord reports it), 'that unless they may have these outward trappings, or worldly pomp added to the ministry, their calling will grow into contempt.' First, there was never any age in any kingdom Christian, in which the Bishops were ridden with so much scorn and contempt as they are at this day in England; and this makes this Lord, though he be a very ordinary horseman for any good service, please himself with 'trappings.' Secondly, for the 'worldly pomp' which he means and expresses, the train of that hath been long since cut short enough in England; and he that will not look upon the Bishops with an evil eye must needs acknowledge it. Well, but what then doth this position work? Why, [if] they may not have these 'trappings,' there will follow 'contempt upon

their calling;' so he makes the Bishops say. Is this Lord of that opinion too? No sure; for he says—

> *The truth is, these things cast contempt upon them in the eyes of men. They gain them cap and courtesy, but they have cast them out of the consciences of men; and the reason is this, everything is esteemed as it is eminent in its own proper excellency; the eye in seeing, not in hearing; the ear in hearing, not in speaking. The one would be rather monstrous than comely; the other is ever acceptable, being proper. So is it with them: their proper excellency is spiritual, the denial of the world, with the pomps, and preferments, and employments thereof. This they should teach and practise.* [p. 4.]

Well then, the question is, Whether the honour of Bishops and their employments in temporal affairs, as they are at this day moderated, in the Church and State of England, bring contempt upon them and their calling, as this Lord says; or help to keep off contempt, as he says the Bishops would possess the world? First, I am clear of opinion that Solomon was almost as wise as this Lord thinks himself, and yet he says plainly, Eccles. ix. 16, that though wisdom in itself be far better than folly, yet 'the poor man's wisdom is despised, and his words not heard.' And we see in daily experience, that a poor minister's words are as much slighted in the pulpit as a poor man's in the gate. And therefore these things which this Lord calls 'trappings,' are many times very necessary to keep off that 'contempt' and despite which the boisterous multitude, when their sins are reproved, are apt to cast upon them. And whatsoever this Lord thinks, 'tis a great credit and support to the rest of the clergy, and
41 being well used, a great advantage to their calling, that the Bishops and other eminent men of the clergy should have moderate plenty for means, and enjoy honour and external reputation; and though it be well known that the Church considered in abstract, in and by itself only, is not promoted nor advanced by such employments, yet as she is considered in her peregrination and warfare, she gains by them great both strength and encouragement.

Secondly, that which this Lord adds, that those things

'gain the Bishops cap and courtesy, but have cast them out of the consciences of men.' 'Tis well that these things gain them that. For the age is grown so churlish to that calling, that I believe they would have very little of either, were it not for these things; as will too soon appear now this last Act of Parliament hath taken away their 'trappings.' As for that which follows next, that these things 'have cast them out of the consciences of men,' that's not so: for in other kingdoms that are Christian, and some Reformed as well as other, they have more employment in civil affairs than with us, and yet are in high esteem in the 'consciences of men.' But the truth is, schism and separation have so torn men from clergy and Church, from God and Christ and all, that they have not only cast Bishops, but religion too, out of their consciences; and their consciences are thrown after, God knows whither.

Now for the reason which this Lord gives, he is quite wide in that also. For everything is not 'esteemed as it is eminent in its own proper excellency' (as he says it is): indeed it ought to be so, but so it is not. For in the place before cited, Eccles. ix. 16, 'Wisdom is better than folly,' and is most eminent in its own proper excellency, but is it always esteemed so? No sure; for 'the poor man's wisdom is despised.' There, however it ought to be esteemed for its proper excellency, yet if it be found in a poor subject, 'tis despised and accounted as mean and vile as he is that hath it. And as for the illustration which his Lordship makes of this his proposition, 'tis merely fallacious. For arguments drawn from natural things, which ever work constantly the same way, to moral things, which depend upon voluntary and mutable agents, will seldom or never universally follow. And therefore, though it be true, that 'the eye is esteemed for seeing, not hearing; and the ear for hearing, not speaking; and should it be otherwise it would be rather monstrous than comely;' that's true, because they are agents determined *ad unum*, to that one operation, and cannot possibly do the other; but then, by his Lordship's leave, so it is not with Bishops; for though their 'proper excellency' be indeed spiritual, yet they may meddle with other things so long as they can observe the Apostle's rule, 1 Cor. vii. 31, and 'use this

world as if they used it not;' that is, use it so long and so far as may help their service of God, and cast it off when it shall hinder them. But this Lord thinks all use of these things, and employments in them, to be unlawful for our calling. And therefore he adds,—

> *That when they, contrary hereunto, seek after a worldly excellency, like the great men of the world; and to rule and domineer as they do, contrary to our Saviour's pre-*
> 12 *cept,* Vos autem non sic: '*But it shall not be so amongst you:' instead of honour and esteem, they have brought upon themselves, in the hearts of the people, that contempt and odium which they now lie under; and that justly and necessarily, because the world sees that they prefer a worldly excellency, and run after it, and contend for it, before their own; which being spiritual is far more excellent, and which being proper to the ministry, is that alone which will put a value and esteem upon them that are of that calling.* [pp. 4, 5.]

All this which follows is but matter of ampliation, to help aggravate the business, and to make Bishops so hateful to other men, as they are to himself. For I hope no Bishops of this Church do seek after 'worldly excellency' contrary to their function; at least I know none that do: and they are far from being 'like the great men of the world.' As to 'ruling,' 'tis proper enough to them, so far as authority is given; but 'domineer' they do not. This comes from this Lord's spleen, not from their practice: and by that time his Lordship hath sat a while longer in the State, men will find other manner of domineering from him, than they found from the Bishops. Nor do they, in their meddling with civil affairs in such sort as is now practised in England, go contrary to our Saviour's precept, *Vos autem non sic,* 'It shall not be so amongst you,' as I have proved before.

Most true indeed it is, that the poor Bishops of this Church do now, 'instead of honour and esteem, lie under contempt and odium in the hearts of the people.' Of some, not of all; no, nor either of the greater or the better part, for all the noise that hath been raised against them; and this Lord is much deceived to say they have brought it upon themselves. For

it is but part of the dirt which this Lord and his fellow sectaries have most unchristian-like cast upon them: and this only to wrest their votes out of Parliament, that now they are gone, they may the better compass their ends against Church and State, which God preserve against their malice and hypocrisy. But this Lord says further, 'that the Bishops have brought this contempt upon themselves justly and necessarily.' Now God forbid that it should be either; and his Lordship proves it but by saying the same thing over again, namely, 'because the world sees that they prefer a worldly excellency, and run after it, and contend for it, before their own.' And surely if they do this, they are much to blame; but I believe the world sees it not, unless it be such of the world as look upon them with this Lord's eyes, and that when they are at the worst too. And I verily persuade myself, and I think upon very good grounds, that the present Bishops of this kingdom, all or the most of them, are as far from any just tax in this or any other kind, as they have been in any former times since the Reformation. 'Tis true, that their own calling 'being spiritual, is far more excellent;' and I shall the better believe it, when I see this Lord and the rest value it so. For I have told his Lordship already, that everything which is more excellent in itself, is not always so esteemed by others: and though this excellency be never so proper, yet by his good leave, it is not that alone which will put a value and esteem upon them and their calling. There must be some outward helps to encourage, and countenance, and reward them too, or else flesh and blood are so dull, that 43
little will be done. And suppose this religious Lord, and some few like himself, would value and esteem them for their spiritual calling only, yet what are these to so many as would contemn them? And yet to speak the truth freely, I do not see this Lord, nor any of that feather, put a value upon that calling for the spiritual excellency only; for then all ministers that do their duty should be valued and esteemed by them, the calling being alike spiritual and alike excellent in all: whereas the world sees they neither care for nor countenance any ministers, but such as separate with them from the Church of England, or are so near to it, as that they are ready to step into an Independent congregation, so soon as by the artifice

of this Lord and others, it may be made ready to receive them. Now this Lord having thus belaboured these two points, that Bishops by meddling in civil affairs do hurt themselves in their consciences and in their credits; he proceeds to instruct us further. And thus:—

> *As these things hurt themselves in their consciences and credit, so have they, and, if they be continued, still will make them hurtful to others. The reason is, because they break out of their own orb and move irregularly. There is a curse upon their leaving their own place.* [p. 5.]

My Lord is now come to his second general part of his Speech, and means to prove it if he can, that Bishops by any kind of meddling in civil affairs do not only 'hurt themselves in conscience and in credit, but also, if they continue in them, they will make them hurtful to others also.' And that he may seem to say nothing without a reason, his Lordship tells us 'the reason of this is, because they break out of their own orb and move irregularly.' But I conceive this reason weak enough. For first (as is before proved) these 'stars' (to follow my Lord in his metaphor) are not so fixed to their 'orb' of preaching the Gospel, but that they may do other things also at other times, so this be not neglected. And therefore it will not follow, that all their motions out of this orb are 'irregular.' Secondly, when they do thus move, they are not violently to break out of their orb, but to sit still till authority find cause to call any of them a little aside, to attend civil affairs, that they may proceed never the worse, and the Gospel the better. As for that 'curse' which this Lord speaks of, which follows 'upon their leaving of their own place;' I know of none, nor any leaving of their own place. This I am sure of, whatever this Lord says, that many extraordinary blessings and successes have come both upon this kingdom and other nations, by counsels given by clergymen; and I pray God his counsels, such as they have been, do not bring dishonour, and a 'curse' to boot, upon this Church and kingdom. But his Lordship goes on with his metaphor, and argues very strongly by similitudes; which hath but a similitude of argumentation.

The heavenly bodies while they keep within their own spheres give light and comfort to the world; but if they should break out and fall from their regular and proper motions, they would set the world on fire. So have these done. While they kept themselves to the work of the ministry alone, and gave themselves to prayer and the ministry of the word, according to the example of the Apostles, the world received the greatest benefits from them; they were the light and life thereof. But when their ambition cast them down like stars from heaven to earth, and they did grow once to be advanced above their brethren; I do appeal to all who have been versed in the ancient ecclesiastical history, or modern histories, whether they have not been the common incendiaries of the Christian world; never ceasing from contention one with another about the precedency of their Sees and Churches, excommunicating one another, drawing princes to be parties with them, and thereby casting them into bloody wars. [p. 5.]

This argument is grounded upon *Si cœlum ruat,* 'If heaven falls we shall get store of larks.' But heaven cannot fall, and so 'tis here. 'The heavenly bodies while they keep within their own spheres, give light and comfort to the world; but if they should break out,' which is impossible, 'and fall from their regular motions,' which cannot possibly be, 'they would set the world on fire;' or perhaps drown it again (had not God promised the contrary), according as the irregular motion bended. 'So have these done.' Nay, not so, with this Lord's leave. For first, clergymen are not so fixed to their 'orbs' as those heavenly bodies are, but in themselves are free and voluntary agents, which those bodies are not. And secondly, they may and ought, as occasion is offered them, do many things in public civil affairs, which may much advantage the Gospel of Christ, and they will never 'fire the world' by such attendance upon them; and they may and ought 'give themselves to prayer and to the ministry of the word' notwithstanding this: and they may be the same 'benefits' to the world of 'light and life' as before. Yea, and I make no doubt, but that when this Lord and his followers will be as liberal and devout as the primitive Christians were,

who 'sold their land, and brought the money, and laid it at the Apostles' feet,' Acts iv. 37, to make a stock for their and the Church's wants, the Bishops will be well content to follow the Apostles' example, as far and as well as they can. But if the Bishops may meddle with no temporal affairs, 'according to the example of the Apostles;' how came the Apostles to meddle with the receiving first, and after with the layings out of all this money? For, say it was to be employed on charitable actions, yet some diversion more or less it must needs be to the preaching of the Gospel. But since the example and practice of the Apostles is so often pressed by this Lord, I would willingly his Lordship should tell me (if he will make their practice a rule general and binding) why now among Christians all should not be common, as the Apostles and other believers had it; and that no man might say that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, Acts iv. 32; and then where is the property of the subject? And then why do we not go up and down and preach at large, according to the examples of the Apostles, and endure neither division of parishes nor parish churches? And why do we not receive the communion after supper, as 'tis well known Christ and His Apostles did? Indeed, if any Bishops
15 or other clergymen should become 'falling stars' from heaven to earth; especially if their sin should be so like the devil's as to cast themselves down by their own ambition: that, as it makes the fall heavy to them, so yet I must say to this Lord, that both fall and fault is the person's; the episcopal office is not the cause of it, as is here charged by him. Nor did they become 'falling stars' so soon as they did once grow to be advanced above their brethren, as this Lord insinuates it. For among the Apostles themselves there was a chief in order, S. Luke xxii. 26, and some were advanced to dignity and power above their brethren, even in the Apostles' days; whom yet, I presume, this Lord will not be so ill advised as to call 'fallen stars.'

As for the appeal which he makes 'to all them who have been versed in ancient or modern ecclesiastical histories;' that's no great matter. For in all histories you shall find great men of all sorts doing what in honour and duty should not be done; and 'ambition' hath been the cause of very

[illegible] this, and 'ambition' sticks so close to human nature, [illegible] follows it into all professions and estates of men: [illegible] would to God clergymen had been freer from this [illegible] that histories testify they have. But this hath been [illegible] of some: many reverend bishops in all ages [illegible] of it, and 'tis a personal corruption in [illegible] and cannot justly be charged upon the [illegible] as this Lord lays it. Neither have the worst of [illegible] popes of Rome excepted) been the 'common [illegible] of the Christian world.' But 'incendiaries' is [illegible] word of late with this Lord; and some of the [illegible] Bishops of England have been made 'incendiaries' too [illegible] many. But might it please God to 'show some [illegible] for good, that they which hate us may see it, [illegible] Psalm lxxxvi. 17, there would be a full [illegible] who have been the 'incendiaries' indeed in these [illegible] England and then I make no question but it [illegible] this Lord flames as high and as dangerously [illegible] But 'Behold,' (saith God,) 'all ye that [illegible] compass yourselves about with sparks; [illegible] your own fire, and in the sparks which [illegible] This shall ye have of my hand, ye [illegible] Isai. l. 11.

[illegible] to consider, how unworthily, and [illegible] this Lord manages this proof. For all [illegible] to prove it unlawful for Bishops to inter- [illegible] affairs that so to do is hurtful to them- [illegible] and in credit, and to others also by this [illegible] And this he proves by their 'never [illegible] one with another, either about the [illegible] Sees or Churches.' They have indeed [illegible] too eagerly for their Sees [illegible] all, nor any that I know with a [illegible] the Bishop of Rome for his supremacy. [illegible] contentions were about their [illegible] affairs which now should [illegible] proof: and therefore was no [illegible] of the object, but only [illegible] Nor were they out of their orb [illegible] enough. The like is to be said for

that which follows, their 'excommunicating one another'
6 upon these quarrels. As for their 'drawing of princes to be parties with them, thereby casting them into bloody wars;' this hath seldom happened, and whenever it hath happened, some Church business or other hath unhappily set it on, not their meddling in temporal affairs. But whatever caused it, the crime of such misleading of princes is very odious, and as hateful to me, as it can be to his Lordship. But the persons must bear their own faults, and not the calling; and, sure I am, this Lord would think me very wild, if I should charge the ancient barons' wars in England, upon his Lordship and the honourable barons now living. But howsoever by this 'tis plain, that this Lord would not only have the Bishops turned out of all civil employments, but out of their ecclesiastical jurisdictions also. They must have no power nor superiority there neither; their Sees must be laid as level as parity can make them. For all these mischiefs came on (saith he) as soon as they were once advanced above their brethren.

And one thing more I shall take occasion to say. Here's great clamour made against the Bishops, and their meddling in civil affairs; but what if the Presbytery do as much or more? Do they sin too by breaking out of their orb, and neglecting the work of the ministry? No, by no means: only the Bishops are faulty. For do you think that Calvin would have taken on him the umpirage and composing of so many civil causes as he did order between neighbours, if so great sin had accompanied it? For he dealt in civil causes, and had power to inflict civil punishments in his consistory[s]. For he committed divers to prison for dancing, and those not mean ones neither; and he arbitrated divers causes[t]; and in a great controversy between the Senate of Geneva and a gentleman, he tells one Frumentius, who laboured for a reconciliation, that the Church of Geneva was not so destitute, but that *fratres mei* (saith he) *huic provinciæ subeundæ pares futuri essent*[u], some of his brethren might have been fit for that work. Belike he took it ill, that in

[s] "Omnes in carcerem conjecti sunt," &c.—Calvin. Epist. ad Farellum. [p. 64. Genev. 1575.]

[t] Calvin. Epist. ad Viretum, fol. 373. Edit. 1575.

[u] Calvin. Epist. ad Farellum, fol. 384. [Aug. 21, 1547.]

such a business, though merely civil, he and his fellow-ministers should be left out. And for matters in the commonwealth he had so great power in the Senate, and with the people, that all things were carried as he pleased. And himself brags of it, that the Senate was his and the people his[v]. And to increase his strength, and make it more formidable, he brought in fifty or more of the French, his countrymen and friends, and by his solicitation made them free denizens of the city; of which and the troubles thence arising he gave an account to Bullinger[x], *anno* 1555.

Or can you think that Beza would have taken upon him so much secular employment, had he thought it unlawful so to do? For whereas in the form of the civil government of that city, out of the two hundred prime men there was a perpetual Senate chosen of sixty, as Bodin tells us[y]; my worthy predecessor, Archbishop Bancroft[z], assures me, Beza was one of these threescore. And yet what a crying-sin is it grown in a Bishop to be honoured with a seat at the Council-table! Besides this, when Geneva sent a solemn embassy to Henry IV. of France, about the raising of a fort 47
which was built near their city by the Duke of Savoy, Beza would needs go along to commend that spiritual cause unto the king[a]; and how far he dealt, and laid grounds for others to deal in all such civil causes, as were but *in ordine ad spiritualia,* is manifest by himself[b]. And I am sure *læsus proximus* may reach into the cognisance of almost all civil causes. Or can any man imagine that so religious a man as Mr. Damport, the late parson of St. Stephen's in Coleman-street, would have done the like to no small hindrance to Westminster-Hall, had he thought that by this meddling he had hurt both his conscience and his credit, whereas (good man) he fled into New England to preserve both[c]? Or, if Mr. Alexander Henderson would have come along with the

[v] "Senatum esse nostrum."—Calvin. ad Farellum, fol. 72. [iv. Non. Jul. 1546.]

"Populum esse nostrum."—Calvin. ad Viretum, fol. 73. [May 28, 1547.]

[x] Calvin. Epist. ad Viret. [leg. Bulinger.] fol. 163. [Jun. 15, 1555.]

[y] Bodin, lib. ii. de Repub. c. 6. [p. 220. Lugd. 1586.]

[z] Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline, c. 26. [p. 303. Lond. 1593.]

[a] Thuan. Hist. anno 1600. c. cxxv. [*i.e.* lib. cxxv. cap. ix. p. 42. Lond. 1733.]

[b] Beza de Excommun. p. 47. [p. 50. Genev. 1590.]

[c] [See Accounts of Province for 1633. Works, vol. v. p. 818, note [b].]

Scottish army into England, and been a commissioner (as he was) in that whole treaty, wherein many of their Acts of Parliament concerning the civil government of that kingdom were deliberated upon and confirmed, if he had thought his so doing inconsistent with his calling? Or that the Scots (being so religious as they then were, even to the taking up of arms against their King for religion) would have suffered him to take that place upon him, so contrary to the command of Christ and the practice of the Apostles, if it had been so indeed? Or, would they have suffered their preachers, which then attended their commissioners at London, not only to meddle with, but to preach so much temporal stuff as little belonged to the purity of the Gospel, had they been of this Lord's opinion? Surely, I cannot think it. But let the Bishops do but half so much, yea, though they be commanded to do that which these men assume to themselves, and 'tis a venture but it shall prove treason against the fundamental laws of the kingdom, and an endeavouring to bring in an arbitrary government. Well! I'll tell you a tale. There's a minister at this day in London, of great note among the faction, well esteemed by this Lord and others of this outcry against the Bishops' votes in Parliament and their meddling in civil affairs; this man (I'll spare his name) being pressed by a friend of his, how he came to be so eager against the Church, of which, and her government, he had ever heretofore been an upholder, and had subscribed unto it, made this answer: 'Thou art a fool; thou knowest not what it is to be the head of a party.' This man is one of the great masters of the present Reformation; and do you not think it far more inconsistent with his ministerial function, to be in the head of a turbulent faction, (to say the least of them,) than for a Bishop to meddle in civil affairs? Yet such is the religion of our times. But 'tis no matter for all this; his Lordship hath yet more to say against the ambition of the Prelates. For,—

Their ambition and intermeddling with secular affairs and state business, hath been the cause of shedding more Christian blood than anything else in the Christian world; and this no man can deny that is versed in history. [p. 5.]

This is the same over and over again; saving that the expression contains in it a vast untruth. For they that are 'versed in history' must needs say 'tis a loud one, that Bishops 48
meddling in temporal affairs' hath been the cause of shedding more Christian blood than anything else in the Christian world.' What a happiness hath this Lord, that his pale meagreness cannot blush at such thing as this! Yea, but he will prove it here at home in this kingdom. For, says he:—

> *We need not go out of our own kingdom for examples of their insolency and cruelty. When they had a dependency upon the Pope, and any footing thereby out of the land, there were never any that carried themselves with so much scorn and insolency towards the princes of this kingdom, as they have done. Two of them the Bishop that last spake hath named, but instances of many more may be given, whereof there would be no end.* [p. 5.]

'Tis true indeed 'we need not go out of our own kingdom for examples of their insolency and cruelty.' For in so many ages 'tis no wonder in any kingdom to find some bad examples, be it of insolency, cruelty, or what you will; especially in the midst of so much prosperity as accompanied clergymen in those times. But 'tis true too, that there are far more examples of their piety and charity, would this Lord be pleased to remember the one with the other. As for their bad examples, his Lordship gives a reason why not all, but some of them, 'carried themselves with so much scorn and insolency towards their princes,' even with almost as much as this Lord and his faction carry themselves at this day towards their mild and gracious King. And the reason is a true one; 'it was their dependency upon the Pope, and their footing which thereby they had to subsist out of the land;' which may, and I hope will be a sufficient warning to his Majesty and his successors, never to let in again a foreign supreme power into any of his dominions. For 'tis to have one state within, yet not dependent upon the other, which can never be with safety or quiet in any kingdom. And I would have the world consider a little with what insolency, and perhaps disallegiance this Lord and his round-head crew would use their Kings, if they had but half so strong

a foreign dependence as the Bishops then had, that dare use the most gracious of Kings as they do this present day. 'Two of these insolent ones,' (this Lord says,) 'the Bishop that last spake named.' Lincoln stands in the margin, by which it appears that Dr. John Williams, then Bishop of Lincoln, and since Archbishop of York, was the man that named two; but because this Lord names them not, I know not who they are, and therefore can say nothing for or against them, but leave them to that Lord which censured them. As for that which follows, that the 'instances of many more may be given, whereof there would be no end;' this is a piece of this Lord's loud rhetoric, which can have no truth in it, especially relating, as it doth, to this kingdom only.

But whereas this Lord said immediately before, that 'their meddling in state business hath been the cause of shedding more Christian blood than anything else in the Christian world,' and in the very next words falls upon the proof of it in this kingdom: I must put him in mind that one Parliament in England, namely, that which most irreligiously and traitorously deposed Richard II., was the cause of the effusion of more Christian blood amongst us, than all the Bishops that ever were in this kingdom. For that base and unjust Parliament was the cause of all the civil wars, those bloody wars, which began in the heir's time after the usurpation of Henry IV., and ceased not till there were slain of the royal blood , and of nobles and the common people a numberless number. And I heartily beg it of God, that no disloyal Parliament may ever bring this kingdom into the like distress. For our neighbours are far stronger now than they were then, and what desolation it might bring upon us, God in heaven knows. So this Lord may see, if he will, what a Parliament itself, being misgoverned, may do. But will his Lordship think it reason to condemn all Parliaments, because this, and some few more, have done what they should not do, as he here deals by Bishops? Sure he would not. But having done with the Bishops' dependency on the Pope, he goes on and tells us further, that—

Although the Pope be cast off, yet now there is another inconvenience, no less prejudicial to the kingdom, by their sitting in this House; and that is, they have such an

absolute dependency upon the King, that they sit not there as free men. [p. 5.]

I am heartily sorry to see this Lord thus far transported. The Pope is indeed cast off from domineering over King, Church, and State. But I am sorry to hear it from this Lord, that this 'other inconvenience by Bishops sitting in the House of Parliament, is no less prejudicial to the kingdom.' Where, first, I observe that this Lord accounts the Pope's ruling in this kingdom, but a 'matter of inconvenience;' for so his words imply. For that must be one inconvenience, if the Bishops' voting be the other; and I am sure the laws both of this Church and State, make it far worse than an inconvenience. Had I said thus much, I had been a Papist out of question. Secondly; I'll appeal to any prudent and moderate Protestant in the Christian world, whether he can possibly think that the Bishops' having votes in the Parliaments of England can possibly be as great, or no less an inconvenience, than the Pope's supremacy here? And I believe this Lord, when he thinks better of it, will wish these words unsaid.

Well! but what then is this 'inconvenience' that is so great? Why, my Lord tells us, 'tis because they have such an 'absolute dependency upon the King that they sit not there as free men.' Where first, 'tis strange to me and my reason, that any dependency on the King, be it never so absolute, can be possibly so great an inconvenience to the King, as that upon an independent foreign power is; the King being sworn to the laws, but the Pope being free, and (as he challenges) not only independent from, but superior to, both King and laws. Secondly, I conceive the Bishops' dependency is no more absolute upon the King than is the dependence of other honourable members of that House, and that the Bishops sit there as absolute free men as any others, not excepting his Lordship. And of this belief I must be, till the contrary shall be proved; which his Lordship goes thus about to do:—

That which is requisite to freedom is, to be void of hopes 50
and fears; he that can lay down these is a free man, and will be so in this House: but for the Bishops, as the case

stands with them, it is not likely they will lay aside their hopes; greater bishoprics being still in expectancy; and for their fears, they cannot lay them down, since their places and seats in Parliament are not invested in them by blood, and so hereditary; but by annexation of a barony to their office, and depending upon that office; so that they may be deprived of their office, and thereby of their places, at the King's pleasure. [pp. 5, 6.]

My Lord's philosophy is good enough; for to be 'void of hopes and fears' is very 'requisite to freedom,' and 'he that can lay these down, is a free man,' or may be if he will. But whether he will be so in that great House, I cannot so well tell. For though no man can be free that is full charged with hopes or fears; yet there are some other things which collaterally work upon men, and consequently take off their freedom, almost as much as hopes and fears can do. Such are consanguinity, affinity, especially if the wife bears any sway; private friendship, and above all, faction. And therefore though I cannot think that every man will be a free man in that House, that is 'void of hopes and fears,' yet I believe he may if he will. Now I conceive that in all these collateral stiflings of a man's freedom, the lay Lords are by far less free than the Bishops are.

Again, for the main bars of freedom, 'hopes' and 'fears,' into which all the rest do some way or other fall, I do not yet see, but that Bishops, even as the case stands with them, may be as free, and I hope are, in their voting as temporal Lords. For 'their hopes,' this Lord tells us, ''tis not likely they will lay them aside, greater bishoprics being still in expectancy.' Truly, I do not know why a deserving Bishop may not in due time hope for a better bishopric, and yet retain that freedom which becomes him in Parliament, as well as any nobleman may be noble and free in that great court, and yet have moderated hopes of being called to some great office, or to the Council-table, or some honourable and profitable embassage, or some knighthood of the Garter; of all, or some of which, there is still 'expectancy.' Lay your hand on your heart, my Lord, and examine yourself.

As for 'fears,' his Lordship tells us roundly the Bishops

'cannot lay them down.' Cannot? Are all the Bishops such poor spirits? But why can they not? Why, because their places in Parliament are not 'hereditary, but by annexation of a barony to their office, and depending upon it; so that they may be deprived of their office, and thereby of their place, at the King's pleasure.' First; I believe the Bishops gave their votes in Parliament as freely to their conscience and judgment as this Lord or any other. Secondly; if any of them for fear or any other motive have given their votes unworthily; I doubt not but many honourable Lords have at some time or other forgot themselves and borne the Bishops company: though in this I commend neither. Thirdly; I know some Bishops who had rather lose not their baronies only, but their bishoprics also, than vote so unworthily as this Lord would make the world believe they have done. 51 Lastly; it is true their seat in Parliament depends on their barony, their barony on their office; and if they be deprived of their office, both barony and seat in Parliament are gone. But I hope my Lord will not say we live under a tyrant; and then I will say Bishops are not deprivable of their office, and consequently not of the rest, at the King's pleasure. But this Lord proceeds into a further amplification: and to whet his inveterate malice against the King, says as follows. Nay,

> *They do not so much as sit here* dum bene se gesserint, *as the Judges now by your Lordships' petition to the King have their places granted them, but at will and pleasure; and therefore as they were all excluded by Edward the First, as long as he pleased, and laws made* excluso Clero, *so may they be by any King at his pleasure in like manner. They must needs therefore be in an absolute dependency upon the Crown, and thereby at devotion for their votes, which how prejudicial it hath been, and will be to this House, I need not say.* [p. 6.]

If I could wonder at anything which this Lord doth or says in such arguments as these, when his heart is up against the clergy, I should wonder at this. For if he will not suppose the King's government to be tyrannical, the Bishops have their places during life, and cannot justly be put out of

them, unless their miscarriage be such as shall merit a deprivation. And therefore, by this Lord's good leave, they have as good a tenure as the judges' is of a *quamdiu bene se gesserint.* And this they have without their Lordships' petition to the King, as his Lordship tells us was fain to be made for the judges, thereby galling the King for giving some patents to the judges during pleasure; which, as the case stood with them, whether he had reason to do or not, I will not dispute. So that manifest it is, that the Bishops do not hold their bishoprics at the King's 'will and pleasure,' and consequently neither their baronies nor their places in Parliament.

And I would have my Lord consider, whether all the noblemen that sit in that House, by blood and inheritance, be not in the same condition upon the matter with the Bishops. For as Bishops may commit crimes worthy deprivation, and so consequently lose their votes in Parliament; so are there some crimes also which noblemen may commit (God preserve them from them), which may consequently void all their rights in Parliament, yea, and taint their blood too.

And as for the Bishops' baronies, they are not at the King's will and pleasure neither: for they hold their baronies from the Crown indeed, but by so long prescription as will preserve them from any disseisure at will and pleasure of the King. So if they merit not deprivation by law and justice, their baronies are safe, and that by as good right, and far ancienter descent, than any the ancientest nobleman of England can plead for himself.

For Edward the First, he was a brave prince, and is of glorious memory, and respected the dutifulness of his clergy very royally. As for the Acts of Parliament made in his time, and the time of his royal successor Edward the Third,
12 I conceive nothing can be gathered out of the titles or prefaces of those Acts, against either the Bishops' presence at, or their voting to those laws, by any prohibition or exclusion of them, by those famous Kings. For though the Statute of Carlisle, 35 Edw. I., not printed, be recited in the statute 25 Edw. III. of Provisoes [d], and says, 'that by the assent of

[d] Et similiter in the statute of 27 Edw. III. and 38 Edw. III., both of Provisoes.

the earls, barons, and other nobles, and all the commonalty, at their instances and requests in the said full Parliament, it was ordained, &c.,' without any mention at all of the prelates; yet it is more than probable, that the prelates were summoned to, and present at these Parliaments. For first, it appears expressly by the Statute of the Staple, 27 Edw. III., made in the same Parliament with the Statute of Provisoes, that the prelates were assembled and present there: and I rather think that in all these Statutes of Provisoes, (being professedly made against the liberty and jurisdiction of the Pope, in those times challenged in this kingdom, to whose power the Bishops were then subject,) they voluntarily chose to be absent, rather than endanger themselves to the Pope, if they voted for such laws, or offend the King and the State, if they voted against them. But these laws were not made *excluso Clero,* and that 'as long as the King pleased,' (as this Lord affirms ;) and this is very plain in the statute itself of 38 Edw. III. For in the last chapter of that statute, though the prelates be omitted in the preamble, yet there 'tis expressly said, 'that the king, the prelates, the dukes, earls and barons,' &c. So here was not exclusion of the Bishops by the King, but their own voluntary absence, which made those kind of laws pass without them.

As for the Parliament at Carlisle, I conceive the books are misprinted, and a common error risen by it. For that Parliament was held *anno* 35 Edw. I. and was the first of Provisoes; and as appears in the Records, the prelates were present. But in 25 Edw. I. the Parliament was summoned to London, and the Bishops called to it[e]. And there was another summons to Salisbury in the same roll[f], to which the prelates were not called. But this, I conceive, was a summons of the King's great Council only, and not of a Parliament, the Commons not being called any more than the Prelates: nor were there any other summons, 25 Edw. I., but these two. That which his Lordship infers upon this, is, that therefore the Bishops are 'in absolute dependency upon the Crown;' which is manifestly untrue, since they cannot be outed at will and pleasure, but for demerit only; and that may fall upon temporal Lords as well as Bishops. And there-

[e] Rotulo Clausar. 25 Edw. I. M. 6. Dorso.

[f] M. 25 Dorso.

fore neither are they at devotion for their votes; and therefore, in true construction, no prejudice can come by them to that honourable House. And I pray God their casting out be not more prejudicial both to State and Church than I am willing to forespeak. After this his Lordship tells us what he hath done in this great argument, saying,—

I have now showed your Lordships how hurtful to themselves and others these things, which the Bill would take away, have been. I will only answer some objections which I have met withal, and then crave your pardon for troubling you so long. [p. 6.]

His Lordship tells us he hath showed 'how hurtful these things are both to the Bishops and others,' which this Bill would hew down; and out of his zeal and love to the Church he hath gone further than any man in this argument; yet I conceive he hath not showed what he thinks he hath. 'Tis true, he hath strongly laboured it; but I hope it will appear he hath not mastered it. I shall now see how he answers such objections, as his Lordship says he hath met with. And the first objection is, his Lordship says,—

1. *That they have been very ancient.*
2. *That they are established by law.*
3. *That it may be an infringement of the House of Peers, for the House of Commons to send up a Bill to take away some of their Members. To these three the answer will be easy.* [p. 6.]

I know not how easy the answer will be; but these must needs be hard times for Bishops, if neither antiquity can fence them against novelty, nor law defend them against violence, nor fear of weakening the House of Peers preserve them against the eagerness of the House of Commons; and that in the very House of Peers itself. Let us see then and consider how easy the answer will be to these, and how sufficient also.

To the first. Antiquity is no good plea; for that which is by experience found hurtful, the longer it hath done hurt, the more cause there is now to remove it, that it may do

no more. Besides, other irregularities are as ancient, which have been thought fit to be redressed; and this is not so ancient, but that it may truly be said, Non fuit sic ab initio. [p. 6.]

This answer may be easy enough; but sure 'tis not sufficient. Nor do I wonder that antiquity is no good plea in this Lord's account; for he is such an enemy to it, that he will have his very religion new. If anything be ancient, it smells of Antichrist. Yea, but if it be found hurtful, 'the longer it hath done hurt, the more cause to remove it.' That's true; if it be hurtful in and of itself; so is not this. If it does hurt constantly or frequently; else you must cast out the lay Lords' votes too, and his Lordship's with the rest. For out of all doubt their votes do hurt sometimes, and it may be more often and more dangerously than the Bishops' votes. And when this Lord shall be pleased to tell us what those 'other irregularities' are, which 'are as ancient' and yet 'redressed,' I will consider of them, and then either grant or deny. In the meantime, I think it hath been proved that it is no irregularity for a Bishop, that is called to it by supreme authority, to give counsel, or otherwise to meddle in civil affairs, so as it take him not quite off from his calling. And for his Lordship's close, that 'this is not so ancient, but that it may be truly said, *Non fuit sic ab initio;*' his Lordship is much deceived. For that speech of our Saviour's, St. Matthew xix. 8, is spoken of marriage, which was instituted in Paradise, and therefore *ab initio*, 'from the beginning,' must there be taken 'from the creation,' or from the institution of marriage soon after it. But I hope his Lordship means it not so here, to put it off that Bishops had not votes in the Parliaments of England from the creation. For then no question but it may be truly said, *Non fuit sic ab initio.* But if his Lordship, or any other, will apply this speech to anything else, which hath not its beginning so high, he must then refer his words and meaning to that time, in which that thing he speaks of took its beginning; as is this particular to the beginning of Parliaments in this kingdom. And then, under favour of this Lord, the voting of Bishops in Parliament is so ancient that it cannot be truly said, *Non*

fuit sic ab initio. For so far as this kingdom hath any records to show, clergymen, both Bishops and Abbots, had free and full votes in Parliament; so full, as that in the first Parliament of which we have any certain records, which was in the forty and ninth year of Henry the Third, there was summoned by the King to vote in Parliament, one hundred and twenty Bishops, Abbots, and Priors, and but twenty-three Lay-Lords. Now there were but twenty-six Bishops in all, and the Lords being multiplied (to the unspeakable prejudice of the Crown) into above one hundred, besides many of their young sons, called by writ in their fathers' lifetime, have either found or made a troubled time, to cast the Bishops and their votes out of the House.

2. *To the objection for being established by law,* his Lordship says, *The law-makers have the same power and the same charge to alter old laws inconvenient, as to make new that are necessary.* [p. 6.]

The law-makers have indeed the same power in them, and the same charge upon them, that their predecessors in former times had; and there's no question but old laws may be abrogated and new ones made. But this Lord, who seems to be well versed in the rules and laws of Government, (which the poor Bishops understand not,) cannot but know that it's a dangerous thing to be often changing of the laws; especially such as have been ancient, and where the 'old' is not 'inconvenient,' nor the 'new necessary;' which is the true state of this business, whatever this Lord thinks.

3. *And for the third objection, the privileges of the House,* this Lord says, *it can be no breach of them. For either estate may propose to the other by way of Bill, what they conceive to be for public good, and they have power respectively of accepting or refusing.* [p. 7.]

This is an easy answer indeed, and very true. 'For either estate in Parliament may propose to the other by way of Bill, and they have power respectively of accepting or refusing;' and there is no breach of privilege in all this. But this easy answer comes not home. For how my Lord understands this objection, I know not; it seems as if it did reach

only to the external breach of some privilege, but I conceive they which made the objection meant much more. As namely, that by this Bill there was an aim in the Commons to weaken the Lords' House, and by making their votes fewer, to be the better able to work them to their own ends in future businesses. So the argument is of equal, if not 55 greater strength against the Lords yielding to the Bill to the infringement of their own strength, than to the Commons proposing it, and there is no doubt but that the Commons might propose their Bill without breach of privilege; but whether the Lords might grant it without impairing their own strength, I leave the future times, which shall see the success of this Act of Parliament, to judge of the wisdom of it, which I shall not presume to do. I thought his Lordship had now done, but he tells us,

4. *There are two other objections, which may seem to have more force; but they will receive satisfactory answers. The one is, that if they may remove Bishops, they may as well next time remove Barons and Earls.* [p. 7.]

This Lord confesses the two arguments following are of more force, but he says 'they will receive satisfactory answers.' And it may be so. But what answers soever they may receive, yet I doubt whether those which that Lord gives be such. For to this of taking away of Barons and Earls next, his Lordship answers two things. First he says,

The reason is not the same; the one sitting by an honour invested in their blood and hereditary, which though it be in the King alone to grant, yet being once granted he cannot take away; the other sitting by a barony depending upon an office, which may be taken away; for if they be deprived of their office, they sit not. [p. 7.]

To this there have been enough said before, yet that it may fully appear this reason is not satisfactory, this Lord should do well to know, or rather to remember, for I think he knows it already, that though these great Lords have and hold their places in Parliament by blood and inheritance, and the Bishops by baronies depending upon their office; yet the King, which gives alone, can no more justly or lawfully

alien away[g] their office without their demerit, and that in a legal way, than he can take away noblemen's honours. And therefore, for aught is yet said, their cases are not so much alike as his Lordship would have them seem. In this indeed they differ somewhat, that Bishops may be deprived upon more crimes, than those are for which Earls and Barons may lose their honours; but neither of them can be justly done by the King's will and pleasure only. But, secondly, for further answer, this Lord tells us,

> *The Bishops sitting there is not so essential. For laws have been, and may be made, they being all excluded; but it can never be showed that ever there were laws made by the King and them, the Lords and Earls excluded.* [p. 7.]

This reason is as little 'satisfactory' to me as the former. For certainly, according to law and prescription of hundreds of years, the Bishops sitting in that House is as 'essential' as the Lords. And this about the laws made without them, is built only upon some difficult emergent cases, from which they desired to be exempt and free themselves: not from
6 any constraint of the State; nor from any opinion of the King, Peers, or people, that it was fit to make laws without them. But to this we have given an answer before.

But this objection of taking away the Earls and Barons next, strikes (as I conceive) another way at the Lords' House, than either of those answers or reasons seem to meet with. And perhaps this Lord himself is willing to pass it by, if he does see it; and 'tis thus. The House of Commons sees and knows well enough, that should they bring up a Bill open, and with a bare edge to take away the votes from the Lords, it could not possibly be endured by either King or Peers. Therefore the Bill which may come to take them away next, and which may be meant in this objection, may be a Bill to make one House of both, and set them all together, under the pretence of greater unity, and more free and quick despatch of all business; all messages and conferences, and breach of correspondences, and differences, happening between the two Houses, while they are two, being by this means taken away. And this I am sure hath been

[g] [In the former edition it was printed 'alone away.']

much spoken of since this Parliament began, and may with far more ease be next compassed now the Bishops are thrust out; both because there are fewer in the Lords' House to help to cast out such a Bill, and because the Commons' House, which would willingly receive the Lords in among them, would never admit the Bishops into their House. So that both ways this is made far more easy to pass. And, should this happen, I would fain know of this Lord, wherein this objection would fail, that they might the next time remove the Barons and the Earls. Not remove them from making laws, (as his Lordship speaks of it,) but remove them into the House of Commons, where their votes shall be swallowed up among the many, and might be quite overmastered, though they should not all agree and vote one way. For then the meanest Commoner in that House would have his vote as great as the greatest Earl's. Whereas now in their own House being distinct, though all the House of Commons agree upon a Bill, or anything else; the Lords may, if they see reason, alter or reject it. So that if hereafter they be reduced to one House, I make no question but their votes are gone next after the Bishops'. And if his Lordship shall think this an impossible supposition; let him know, it is not half so impossible, as that which he made before, of the heavenly bodies breaking out of their own spheres. But we are now come to the last objection, the other of the two which his Lordship says are stronger. And,

5. *The other objection is this, That this Bill alters the foundation of this House; and innovations, which shake foundations, are dangerous.* [p. 7.]

And truly this objection seems to me very strong; but perhaps that is by reason of my weakness; for my Lord tells us before, that it is capable of a 'satisfactory answer;' and here his Lordship gives two for failing.

I answer, first, That if there should be an error in the foundation, when it shall be found, and the master-builders be met together, they may, nay they ought rather to amend it, than to suffer it to run on still to the prejudice and danger of the whole structure. [p. 7.]

This answer, whatever this Lord thinks of it, is not 'satisfactory;' and the thing will be full of danger, whensoever it shall be put to trial. For foundations are seldom meddled withal but with great hazard, and a fundamental error in a kingdom is borne with more safety to the whole, than it can be taken away. And this happens partly because among the many subjects of a kingdom there are different judgments, and as different affections; whence it follows, that all men are not of opinion, that that which is called 'an error in the foundation,' is so indeed: nor do the affections of all men dislike it, nay perhaps the greater, perhaps the better part will approve it. In this case, if the 'master-builders' fall to mending of this somewhat boisterously, may they not rend all in pieces, to fall about their own ears and other men's? And partly, because the 'master-builders' which are to meet to repair the decays of the State, though in all ages they have the same authority to make laws, yet they have not in all ages the same skill and wisdom, for the making or the mending of them. Whence it follows, that even the 'master-builders' themselves may mistake, and call that the error, which is indeed a great part of the strength of the foundation: and so by tampering to mend that which is better already, endanger the shaking, if not the fall, of the whole structure, which they would labour to preserve. And I pray God posterity do not find it, that even the 'master-builders' which are now met, be not so deceived, and with as ill success, in casting the Bishops' votes out of the House, under the name of 'an error in the foundation.' But if this answer satisfy not, his Lordship may hope his next will. For,

> *Secondly,* he says, *This is not fundamental to this House. For it hath stood without them, and done all that appertains to the power thereof without them, yea, they being wholly excluded: and that which hath been done for a time at the King's pleasure, may be done with as little danger for a longer time; and when it appears to be fit, and for public good, not only may, but ought to be done altogether by the supreme power.* [p. 7.]

It seems this Lord distrusts his former answer about mending 'fundamental errors' in a State, and therefore here he

again, 'that Queen Elizabeth might do that which a prince less beloved could not have done;' that is, she might do that with safety, 'which a prince less beloved could not do,' that is, not do with safety. But whatsoever is lawful for one prince to do, is as lawful for another; though perhaps not so expedient, in regard of what will be well or ill taken by the people. But otherwise the people's affection to the prince can be no rule nor measure of the prince's justice to the people.

I will be bold to give him another instance. King Charles demanded ship-money all over the kingdom. Either he did this justly and legally for the defence of himself and the public; or he did it at his 'will and pleasure,' thinking that an honourable and fit way of defence. I am sure this Lord will not say he did it legally, for his vote concurred to the condemning of it in Parliament: and if he say he did it at his own 'will and pleasure,' then I would fain know of his Lordship, whether this which was done for a time at the King's pleasure, 'may be done with as little danger' to the liberty of the subject and the property of his goods, 'for a longer time,' and so be continued on the subject? And if he says it may, why did he vote against it as a thing dangerous? And if he says it may not, then he must condemn his own proposition. For he cannot but see, that that which is once done, or done for a short time, at a prince's 'will and pleasure,' cannot be often repeated or continued, but with far greater danger than it was once done. Though for the thing itself, if it were not legal, I am sorry it is not made so. For it would be, under God, the greatest honour and security that this nation ever had: whereas now the tugging which falls out between the King's power and the people's liberty, will in time (unless God's infinite mercy prevents it) do that in this kingdom, which I abhor to think on.

This Lord goes on yet and tells us, that 'that which hath been so done for a time, when it appears to be fit and for public good, not only may, but ought to be done altogether by the supreme power.' So then here this is his Lordship's doctrine, that that which was once done at a prince's will and pleasure, when it shall appear 'to be fit, and for the public good,' (as he supposeth here the taking away of

Bishops' votes to be,) it 'not only may, but ought to be done altogether by the supreme power,' as now that is done by Act of Parliament. 'Not only may, but ought'! Soft a little; his Lordship had the same phrase immediately before. Why but, first, every thing that is fit, ought not by and by to be made up into a law: for fitness may vary very often, which laws should not. Secondly, everything that is for the 'public good,' is not by and by to be made up into a law. For many things in times of difficulty and exigency may be 'for public good,' which in some other times may be hurtful, and therefore not to be generally bound within a law. And if his Lordship shall say, as here he doth, that they
60 'ought to be done altogether,' and be made up into a law 'by the supreme power,' but fitted only to such times; under his Lordship's favour, that ought not to be neither. For let such a law be made, and he that is once master of the times, will have the law ready to serve his turn and theirs, whether the times bear the like necessity or not.

And since everything that is 'fit, and is for public good,' ought not by and by, without more experience of it, to be made up into a law; then much less that which 'appears' so; yea, though it appear never so evidently; yea, and to the wisest Parliament that ever sat. 'Tis true, they 'may' make such a thing into a law, and 'tis fit for the most part so to do; but to say they 'ought' to do it, is more than I can believe. For no Parliament is or can be so wise as to be infallible, and no evidence can be so apparent unto them in those things of infinite variety for the public good, and in which is so much uncertainty, but that they may both piously and prudently forbear the making of some of them into a law if they please. But no man may forbear that which he 'ought' to do, when he ought to do it. And till that time comes, he ought not. This Lord hath now done, and so have I: and I shall end with my prayers to God, that this Act of Parliament now made to cast the Bishops and their votes out of the Parliament, how 'fit' soever it seems, and how much soever it 'appears' to this Lord 'to be for the public good,' do not turn to the decay of religion, and the great damage and detriment of King and Peers, of Church and State. *Amen.*

NOTES OF A SPEECH

AGAINST

PRYNNE AND SPARKES,

FEB. 15, 1633,

FOR THE PUBLICATION OF HISTRIOMASTIX [a].

[Tanner MSS. No. ccxcix. p. 343, al. 133.]

BEFORE I came to this place, which indeed I never thought to have come unto, then I used injunctions concerning the licensing of books. Few have passed my way, but what did, my chaplains have set their hands to them, with their approbation and enumeration of the pages of the licensed copy. For Mr. Buckner, I have a great mind to spare him, but I cannot. Less I cannot censure him than 200*l.* and imprisonment [b]. I know him to be a modest and conformable man, but I find many things amiss in the passage of licensing this book. For Sparkes, he hath a wife and seven children; he hath been a refractory fellow, but since he hath been punished with authority is become more conformable. For his fault, I agree with my Lord Cottington [c]. For Mr. Prynne, I am heartily sorry for him; for indeed I hold him guilty of high treason by a statute of Edward the Third. I cannot tell whether it be yet repealed. As for the book, my Lord Richardson left out the latter part of the verse, *cui lumen ademptum.* I wonder at it, for I see no light of grace in it at all; no one page in the book but hath such scurrility, such scandal, that we may very well say, *Cui lumen ademptum.* It is a scandalous book against the State in an infamous manner. My Lord of Dorset hath sufficiently defended the

[a] [These Notes are unfortunately here inserted out of their proper order according to date. But their existence was not known to the Editor when the earlier part of this volume was printed.]

[b] [Thomas Buckner, the licenser, who had been Chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, was sentenced to be severely admonished, to temporary imprisonment, and a fine of 50*l.*]

[c] [Sparkes, the printer, was fined 500*l.*, and sentenced to stand in the pillory.]

Queen[d]; yet I will add one thing: If all the malice of the world were infused into one eye, yet it could not see anything whereby to disparage her. But his intentions (you say) were good. I am sure that *ex abundantiâ cordis os loquitur*[e]. You say that he hath not vented himself positively, but relatively; and so where he maketh mention of these present times, I am sure that he compareth Antichristian London with Pagan Rome. So for plays, he saith that they are in the best acceptation altogether abominable; that those that see them are devils incarnate. Mr. Hern[f] said, that all this was but an omission of his duty: I say, that it was a most wilful commission of no less than treason. Another said, that he was like the astronomer, who looked up to heaven. Nay, he rather looked down to hell, and from thence fetched such bloody doctrine. Now, Rome may cease all those bloody plots. We have those amongst us will hold up their doctrine against kings and princes. Buchanan, in his Chronicle, reports of the King's grandmother, that she was mildly censured *ab iratis civibus:* the citizens were her censurers: she was a lady thrust into all sorts of extremities. What though princes were tyrants? Must therefore the subjects be discharged of their allegiance? The Church hath other manner of arms, (as my Lord Richardson observed,) *preces et lacrymæ*[g]. Yet all this is done in a sanctified revelation. Nay, they go further; not only to censure and kill kings and princes, but to allow rewards for them that shall do it. For this kind of doctrine, we have had maintainers of it as well in England as in Scotland; witness Perry and Coppinger. In the reign of Edward the 6th, there was one Poynet, Bishop of Rochester, afterwards unworthily translated to Winchester. He put out a book to that effect, called 'Political Instruction[h];' and

[d] [The Earl of Dorset's speech, and the other speeches here referred to, are to be found in Rushworth, vol. ii. pp. 231—241.]

[e] [Matth. xii. 34.]

[f] [One of Prynne's counsel. He afterwards defended Archbishop Laud at his trial.]

[g] [Vide S. Ambr. Serm. contr. Auxent. § 2; ad fin. Epist. xxi. Op., tom. ii. col. 864. B.; et Grat. Decret. Par. ii. Caus. xxiii. Quæst. viii. cap. iii. 'Non pila.']

[h] [The title of the book is, 'A Treatise of Political Power, and of the true Obedience which Subjects owe to Kings and other Civil Governors, &c.' It first appeared in 1556, after Poynet's death, and was reprinted in 1642. See Strype, Memorials, vol. iii. par. i. p. 535.]

this book was divers times daring for the press; but I still suppressed them. If that book were paralleled for mischief, I will forfeit my credit. You say, that Nero was killed, and that justly, for seeing a play; but it had been more probable that he was killed for killing his mother; and, as I take it, he was killed the selfsame day that he killed her. I speak not this to maintain plays: look into my life—I was never play-hunter; yet I have not forborne them for any hurt in themselves, but for fear of injury to one that should be weaker. I have observed at Court, some Puritans to be at a play because they would not be thought Puritans; and for better testimony that they have been there, have stood under the candlestick, and been dropped on by the candles, and so have carried away a remembrance of the place. If your Lordships, after pains taken in the managing of State affairs, grow weary, what is more fit than to take your recreations? But Mr. Prynne will not allow you to see a play—they are, in his opinion, *mala per se*. But I say, take away the scurf and rubbish which they are incident unto, they are things indifferent. In those primitive times of the first 300 years after Christ, they were full of idolatry; but when that was taken off which was *contra fidem*, then they fell into another strain almost as bad, that was *contra bonos mores*, and therein they were abusive; and if there be such things in them now, it is a scandal and not to be tolerated. I leave that care to my Lord Chamberlain, or to the Master of the Revels, whom it concerns to look into it; but I will look that there shall be no abuse of Scriptures in them. I had the King's players lately before me for the like abuse. But what of all this? Mr. Prynne saith, that they are altogether unlawful. He will be thought to be a *Doctor gentium;* he will take upon him to decide all controversies. There is not one true syllogism in all his book: either the proposition is false, or else, if he chance to make a true conclusion, then it is false by accident. For example, p. 9: 'That which hath birth from the devil is sin; but stage plays have their birth from the devil; therefore stage plays are sinful.' It is true, Mr. Prynne, that the Fathers discommended plays as sinful, —and good reason too: they did then make the tragedy real, ending in one another's lives, committed rapes and the

like, which was odious. Besides, Mr. Prynne, is the devil all evil? Then he was so in the creation. Take heed of that opinion,—that is perfect Manicheism. Well, but you will have all plays cried down for the abuse that is in them. The Pagans used them. Thus I will not only prove meat and drink to be unlawful, but Christian religion. That which is abused by any is unlawful; but the Christian religion hath been abused by forty heathen writers; therefore, Christian religion is unlawful. Thus, by your arguments *in totâ latitudine et genere,* this was never the opinion of any philosophy, but quite contradictory. But these things should have come within the censure of the Church. Your Lordships have laid so much upon him, that there is small hope to have him brought thither. I might add, in this place, the sentence of excommunication against him; but seeing he is to be immured, the Church will have so much charity as to afford him her prayers; more than he hath deserved at her hands. But why is Mr. Prynne thus angry at plays? Clemens Alexandrinus[i] quotes one Ezechielus, a Jew, to have written a play in the first 100 years after Christ, called the 'Tragedy of Moyses,' and (saith he) the Fathers commended him for it. So likewise, 300 years after Christ, Gregory Nazianzene, one who was never equalled for learning in the Greek Church, made a tragedy called 'Christus Patiens.' But these, you'll say, are ancient. I will come to the times of the Reformation: Nich. Causinus wrote a play, and all the nobles of Germany came to see it. Yes, but this was on the Jesuitical side. John Foxe, I think it was he which wrote 'Acts and Monuments of the Church,' set out a play called 'Christus Triumphans.' Buchanan, a better poet than a subject, wrote a play called 'Baptistes et Jephtha[k].' If plays had been *mala per se,* then Beza (one whom you will allow of) would not have written a play in French, his own language, called 'Abrahamus Sacrificans.' But you will say, It was done amongst his *juvenilia.* I would they had been burnt before the world had seen them[l].

[i] [S. Clemens Alex. Strom. lib. i.]

[k] [These were the titles of two of Buchanan's plays.]

[l] [Prynne, as is well known, was condemned to pay a fine of 5,000*l.*, to be expelled from Lincoln's Inn and the University of Oxford, to be twice placed in the pillory, to lose both his ears, to have his book burnt, and to be a prisoner for life.]

LETTERS.

LETTER I.

TO SIR WILLIAM HERRICK [a].

[Nichols's Leicestershire, vol. iii. p. 163.]

To the Right Worshipful my very loving Friend, Sir William Herricke, Knight.

SIR,—I understand by Mr. Wrenn[b], that you have been very kind to the College, in moving Mr. Henshaw[c] to battlement all the inside of the house. I pray, let me be so much beholding to you to send me certain word how it stands, and (if it may be) this week. If I hear from you, you shall receive my answer, and a letter in it to Mr. Henshaw, to whom I think not fit to write till I hear the certainty. The gentleman, at your being at Oxford, spake unto me to send him word about Michaelmas an estimate of the charges, which I promised to do so soon as one side was done; but that is not yet finished, and myself have been out of town this three weeks; but I will send him a note so soon as I can. In the meantime, if you have prevailed with him to undertake the whole square within (as I am informed you have), we are bound to you both, and, for my own part,

[a] [Sir W. Herrick was sent by Queen Elizabeth as ambassador to the Porte, and on his return held an office in the Exchequer; was knighted by James I. April 1, 1605, and afterwards appointed Teller of the Exchequer. He married Joan, daughter of Richard and Mary May, of Mayfield-place, in Sussex. Mrs. May was the foundress of the Divinity Lectureship in St. John's College, Oxford, which was held by Laud, as he mentions in his Diary. Nichols's Leicestersh. vol. iii. pp. 150, 151, 163.]

[b] [Christopher Wren, younger brother of Dr. Matthew Wren, Bishop of Ely. He succeeded him in the Deanery of Windsor, and was the father of the celebrated Sir Christopher.]

[c] [Several persons of this name were members of the Merchant Tailors' Company, and thus interested in St. John's College.]

I shall rest very thankful to you for it, and will be ready to deserve it in my love for yours. I pray commend me to your good Lady; and let me receive your answer. So I leave you to the grace of God; and shall ever rest your very loving friend,

WILLIAM LAUD.

St. John's, Oct. 21, 1616.

LETTER II.

TO MILES SMITH, BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

[Prynne's Cant. Doom, p. 77.]

MY LORD,—My love and service remembered unto your Lordship: when I came to do my duty to his Majesty at Christmas, it seemed by the speech he uttered to me, that somebody had done the poor Church of Gloucester no very good office. For his Majesty was graciously pleased to tell me, he was informed, that there was scarce ever a Church in England so ill governed, and so much out of order; and withal required me in general, to reform and set in order what I there found amiss. Hereupon, at my being at Gloucester, I acquainted the Chapter with that which his Majesty had said to me, and required at my hands; and took as good order (as in so short a space I could), both for repair of some parts of the edifice of the Church, and for redress of other things amiss. Among the rest, not rashly and of myself, but by a Chapter Act[d], I removed the Communion-table from the middle of the quire to the upper end, the place appointed to it, both by the Injunctions of this Church[e], and by the practice of all the King's Majesty's Chapels, and all other Cathedral Churches in the kingdom which I have seen. This act, since my coming thence, (as I am by letters informed[f],) is very much traduced by some in the city, and a libel against it laid in the pulpit of St. Michael's[g], where Master Sub-Dean[h] preaches, to the great

[d] [See vol. iv. pp. 233, 234.]

[e] [Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, ad fin. Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. p. 188.]

[f] [By Henry Aisgill and Elias Wrench, two of the Prebendaries, and probably by the Sub-Dean, and Robinson, the Chapter-Clerk. See Aisgill and Wrench's Letter, Prynne's Cant. Doom, p. 76.]

[g] [This libel was a letter written by John White, the Bishop's Chaplain, to the Chancellor at Gloucester. See Prynne, ibid. pp. 75, 76.]

[h] [Thomas Prior.]

scandal of the Church and the laws established. Good my Lord, let me desire this favour at your Lordship's hands, that these things may be ordered, and that your Lordship will join to reform such tongues and pens, as know not how to submit to any law but their own. I must upon this of force have his gracious Majesty acquainted both with the thing itself, and the entertainment which it hath found among turbulent spirits. And I presume his Majesty will be well pleased to hear, that your Lordship, as in other things, so in this, is careful to preserve order, and peace after it, in the Church. Thus not doubting but your Lordship will be careful to rectify what is amiss, I for this time (being full of my business for Scotland[1]) humbly take my leave, and shall ever rest

Your Lordship's in all love and service,

WILLIAM LAUD.

Saint John's, Feb. 27, 1616.

LETTER III.

TO RICHARD NEILE, BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

[Prynne's Cant. Doom, pp. 77, 78.]

My humble duty and service remembered unto your Lordship, &c. When I was at London at Christmas to do my duty unto his Majesty, he was pleased very graciously to tell me, that the Church of Gloucester (as his Majesty had been informed) was more, or as much out of order as any Church in England, and to require me to order such things as I there found amiss. Upon this admonition of his gracious Majesty to me, when I came to Gloucester, I passed with the consent of the Chapter two Acts; one for the repair of the edifice of the Church, which is extremely decayed in the fairest places; the other for the remove of the Communion-table, which stood almost in the midst of the quire. And I, with the general consent of all the Prebends present, after the Act made, removed it, and placed it, as it stands in his Majesty's Chapels, and all well-ordered Cathedral Churches,

[1] [Laud set out for Scotland with King James, March 14, 1616. See Diary.]

and thus much I signified to your Lordship from Gloucester. Since which time there hath been a letter, or libel, found in a pulpit of one of the churches in the city, against both me and that act, in which the author (as yet not known) wonders that the Prebends would not resist me, and complains that there was in none of them the spirit of Elias, &c. To prevent further stir in the city, some think it very fit, that the High Commission would take some speedy order about it, to send a Commission down or otherwise, as they in their wisdom think fit. The circumstances, because they are many, I will omit, and instead of them I have herein sent your Lordship a copy of the libelling letter as it was sent to me, and a copy of a letter sent to me subscribed by two of the Prebends, and a copy of so much of a letter as concerns this business sent by Master Pryor, now Sub-Dean, that so your Lordship may see the whole sum of the business. Upon the receipt of these letters I writ unto my Lord of Gloucester; but what course for redress of these things his Lordship will take, I know not. I beseech your Lordship let me have your lawful assistance, that so long as I do nothing, but that which is established and practised in our Church, I may not be brought into contempt at my first entrance upon that place by any turbulent spirits, and so disenabled to do that good service which I owe to the Church of God. And if it stand with your Lordship's liking, I will humbly desire that his gracious Majesty might know, what successes I have in beginning to reform what I have found amiss in that place. In the close of our Sub-Dean's letter, your Lordship shall see a strange monster, lately born in that city of Gloucester. I pray God the Puritans, which swarm in those parts, do not say it was one of God's judgments, for turning the Communion-table into an Altar. I would have waited upon your Lordship for all my business, and have brought these papers myself, but that I am unable at this time by sickness to come out of my chamber. Therefore I take my leave, and shall ever rest,

Your Lordship's in all love and duty,

WILLIAM LAUD.

St. John's College, upon March 3, 1616.

LETTER IV.

TO SIR ROBERT COTTON.

[Ellis's Orig. Letters, Series 2, vol. iii. Letter 263 [k].]

SIR,—After long deliberation, I am bold to impart a business unto you which troubles me. It is not long since I was President of St. John's College, in Oxon; and during the time I was in that place, Sir William Paddye (a worthy benefactor to that poor College[l]) importuned the lending of an ancient volume of Beda to you, which the Statutes of that house could not well bear; but that it was thought at that time unfit to distaste a man that had done so much good for the College, and intended much more. The cause which he alleged was, that you had use of it for some things that concerned your house and inheritance.

Upon my coming away from that headship, there began (as there uses in such societies) a faction about the choice of a new governor. The heat that was then struck is not yet quenched in the losing party; and out of an opinion that I had some hand in the business for him that obtained[m], they have been so angry with me, that they have not only been content to forget all the service I did that College, (which I can without vanity say was some,) but have picked all the occasions they could to detract from me.

That which they have most colour for against me, is the lending of this part of Beda out of the library; and though at that time when it was done, their consents were more forward than other honester men's, yet now they are over bold with my reputation, and charge all the guilt of the action upon me, and more too.

Sir, if it please you to think me worth the having, you have now an opportunity to bind me to you; and if it please you to let me have this book to send back to the College, and to take off that which troubles my own mind, and gives some unadvised men too much occasion to be bold with me, you shall in lieu of it have my continual service; and if any-

[k] [From MSS. Cotton. Julius C. III. fol. 152.]

[l] [See vol. iii. p. 136, note [a].]

[m] [William Juxon, afterwards Bishop of London, and Archbishop of Canterbury.]

thing of worth in like kind come to my hands, in any place, where God shall send me to live, I will freely give it in recompence. This hath been the occasion which hath kept me from begging your acquaintance; and because I find that I suffer at the College every day more than other for it, (though the President and some of the Seniors, out of their due respect to Sir William Paddy, forbear,) I am very desirous to do two things at once; namely, to quit that business, and to make myself both known and a debtor to you, both at once. I will hope you will refuse me in neither. And so for this time I leave you to the grace of God, and shall be ready to show myself both to you and to your worth,

Your very loving Friend,

GUIL. MENEVEN.

Durham House, November 22, 1623.

LETTER V.

TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

[Cabala, p. 115. Lond. 1663 [n].]

MY MOST GRACIOUS LORD,—I may not be absent, and not write. And since your Grace is pleased with the trouble, I must profess myself much content with the performance of the duty. I am not unmindful of the last business your Grace committed to me [o]; but I have as yet done the less in it, because I fell into a relapse of my infirmity; but, I thank God, I am once more free, if I can look better to myself, as I hope I shall.

My Lord, I must become an humble suitor to your Grace. I hear, by good hand, that my Lord of Canterbury intends shortly to renew the High Commission. Now I am to acquaint your Grace, that there is never a Bishop that lives about London left out of the Commission but myself, and many that live quite absent are in, and many inferiors to Bishops. The Commission is a place of great experience, for

[n] [From MSS. Harl. No. 7000. fol. 99.]

[o] [This appears to refer either to Mr. Crumpton's papers, or to the tract about Doctrinal Puritanism. See Diary, Dec. 21 and 23, 1624.]

any man that is a governor in the Church; and since, by his Majesty's gracious goodness, and your Grace's sole procurement, I am made a governor, I would be loth to be excluded from that which might give me experience, and so enable me to perform my duty. I am sure my Lord of Canterbury will leave me out, as hitherto he hath done, if his Majesty be not pleased to command that I shall be in. This I submit to your Grace, but humbly desire, even against my own case and quiet, that I may not be deprived of that experience which is so necessary for my place*. I most humbly beseech your Grace to pardon this boldness, and to know, that in my daily prayers for your Grace's happiness, I shall ever rest

Your Grace's most devoted and affectionate Servant,

GUIL. MENEVENSIS.

Nov. 18, 1624.

* [The Bishop was placed on the High Commission Jan. 21, 1624. See Rymer, Fœd. VII. iv. 171—181.]

LETTER VI.

TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

[Cabala, pp. 110, 111 [p].]

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,—We are bold to be suitors to you in the behalf of the Church of England, and a poor member of it, Mr. Montague, at this time not a little distressed. We are not strangers to his person, but it is the cause which we are bound to be tender of.

The cause, we conceive, (under correction of better judgment,) concerns the Church of England nearly; for that Church, when it was reformed from the superstitious opinions broached or maintained by the Church of Rome, refused the apparent and dangerous errors, and would not be too busy with every particular school-point. The cause why she held this moderation was, because she could not be able to preserve any unity amongst Christians, if men were forced to subscribe to curious particulars disputed in schools.

Now, may it please your Grace, the opinions which at this time trouble many men in the late work of Mr. Montague [q],

[p] [From MSS. Harl. No. 7000, fol. 90.]

[q] [See note on Diary, July 7, 1625.]

are, some of them, such as are expressly the resolved doctrine of the Church of England, and those he is bound to maintain. Some of them, such as are fit only for schools, and to be left at more liberty for learned men to abound in their own sense, so they keep themselves peaceable and distract not the Church; and, therefore, to make any man subscribe to school-opinions may justly seem hard in the Church of Christ, and was one great fault of the Council of Trent. And to affright them from those opinions in which they have (as they are bound) subscribed to the Church, as it is worse in itself, so it may be the mother of greater danger.

May it please your Grace further to consider, that when the clergy submitted themselves in the time of Henry the Eighth, the submission was so made, that if any difference, doctrinal or other, fell in the Church, the King and the Bishops were to be judges of it in a National Synod or Convocation; the King first giving leave, under his Broad Seal, to handle the points in difference.

But the Church never submitted to any other Judge, neither, indeed, can she, though she would. And we humbly desire your Grace to consider, and then to move his most gracious Majesty (if you shall think fit), what dangerous consequences may follow upon it. For, first, if any other judge be allowed in matter of doctrine, we shall depart from the ordinance of Christ, and the continual course and practice of the Church.

2. Secondly, if the Church be once brought down beneath herself, we cannot but fear what may be next struck at.

3. Thirdly, it will some way touch the honour of his Majesty's dear father, and our most dread Sovereign of glorious and ever blessed memory, King James, who saw and approved all the opinions of this book; and he in his rare wisdom and judgment would never have allowed them, if they had crossed with truth and the Church of England.

4. Fourthly, we must be bold to say, that we cannot conceive what use there can be of civil government in the Commonwealth, or of preaching and external ministry in the Church, if such fatal opinions, as some which are opposite and contrary to these delivered by Mr. Montague, are and shall be publicly taught and maintained.

5. Fifthly, we are certain, that all or most of the contrary opinions were treated of at Lambeth, and ready to be published, but then Queen Elizabeth, of famous memory, upon notice given how little they agreed with the practice of piety and obedience to all government, caused them to be suppressed; and so they have continued ever since, till of late some of them have received countenance at the Synod of Dort. Now, this was a Synod of that nation, and can be of no authority in any other national Church till it be received there by public authority; and our hope is that the Church of England will be well advised, and more than once over, before she admit a foreign Synod, especially of such a Church as condemneth her discipline and manner of government, to say no more.

And, further, we are bold to commend to your Grace's wisdom this one particular. His Majesty (as we have been informed) hath already taken this business into his own care, and most worthily referred it in a right course to Church-consideration. And we well hoped that, without further trouble to the State, or breach of unity in the Church, it might so have been well and orderly composed, as we still pray it may. These things considered, we have little to say for Mr. Montague's person; only thus much we know, he is a very good scholar, and a right honest man; a man every way able to do God, his Majesty, and the Church of England great service. We fear he may receive great discouragement, and, which is far worse, we have some cause to doubt this may breed a great backwardness in able men to write in defence of the Church of England against either home or foreign adversaries, if they shall see him sink in fortunes, reputation, or health, upon his book-occasion.

And this we most humbly submit to your Grace's judgment, and care of the Church's peace and welfare. So, recommending your Grace to the protection of Almighty God,

We shall ever rest at your Grace's service,

Jo. Roffens. [Buckeridge.]
Jo. Oxon. [Howson.]
Guil. Meneven. [Laud.]

2 August, 1625.

LETTER VII.

TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

[Cabala, p. 116 [r].]

My most gracious Lord,—I am heartily glad to hear your Lordship is so well returned [s], and so happily as to meet so great joy. God hath, among many others His great blessings, (and I know your Grace so esteems them,) sent you now this extraordinary one, a son to inherit his father's honours, and the rest of God's blessings upon both. So soon as I came to an end of my journey, I met the happy news of God's blessing upon your Grace [t], and it seasoned all the hard journey I have had out of Wales through the snow. When I had rested myself a little at my friend's house in the forest, (Mr. Windebank, a servant of your Grace's, whom I made bold to make known to your Honour,) I came to Windsor, in hope to have been so happy as to meet your Grace at the great solemnity; but when I came, I found that which I suspected, that your Grace's greater joy would carry you further. Which journey, and the cause, and the end of it, I heartily wish, and pray, may be full of joy and all contentment to your Grace. I made bold to trouble your Grace with a letter, or two, out of Wales, which I hope Mr. Windebank took the best care he could to see delivered. I have no means to do your Grace any service, but by my prayers; and they do daily attend, and shall ever, while I breathe to utter them. I hope, though I have missed this opportunity, yet I shall be so happy as to see and wait upon your Grace at London. In the meantime, and ever, I leave your Grace, and all your home-blessings, to the protection of the Almighty, and ever shall be found,

Your Grace's most devoted and affectionate Servant,

Guil. Meneven.

Windsor, Decemb. 13, 1625.

[r] [From MSS. Harl. No. 7000, fol. 102.]

[s] [He had been absent in the Low Countries.]

[t] [See Diary, Nov. 24, 1625.]

LETTER VIII.

TO DR. AUBREY, CHANCELLOR OF THE DIOCESE OF ST. DAVID'S.

[Prynne's Hidden Works of Darkness, pp. 78, 79.]

AFTER my hearty commendations, &c. It will appear from the several copies under written from his royal Majesty to the Lord's Grace of Canterbury, and from my Lord's Grace to me, what care his Majesty hath for the preservation of true religion, settled and established in this kingdom. The terms of these letters are as followeth:

[Then follow, in Prynne, the letters of the King, and Archbishop Abbot. The Bishop's letter proceeds:]

These are therefore to will and require you, and every one of you, through the several Archdeaconries within my Diocese, that there be all possible care taken of such as are any way backward in points of religion, and more especially of known and professed Recusants; that they may be carefully presented, and proceedings had against them to excommunication, according to form and order of law; and that there be a true list and catalogue after every Easter yearly sent unto me, that, according to the order of these letters, I may be able to have it ready, and deliver it up to my Lord of Canterbury; and for the better effecting of this, I must and do further require, that the Register do write out several copies of these letters, and issue them into the several Archdeaconries, that none may plead ignorance of their duty in this behalf, as you must look to answer it further, if fault be found to rest upon you. Thus, not doubting of your religious care and duty to the Church and State, I leave you all to the grace of God, and rest

Your loving Friend and Brother,

Westmin. Jan. 14, 1625. GUIL. MENEVENSIS.

To the Right Worshipful, my very loving Friends, Dr. Aubrey, Chancellor of the Diocese of St. David's, and all his Surrogates and Deputies within the several Archdeaconries, these be delivered.

LETTER IX.

TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

[MSS. Harl. 7000. Art. 104.]

To my most gracious Lord the Duke of Buckingham, these.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE,—Upon your last letters, directed to the Bishop of Winchester, signifying his Majesty's pleasure, that, taking to him the Bishops of London, Durham, Rochester, Oxford, and St. David's, or some of them, he and they should take into consideration the business concerning Mr. Montague's late book, and deliver their opinions touching the same, for the preservation of the truth, and the peace of the Church of England, together with the safety of Mr. Montague's person[u]; we have met and considered, and for our particulars do think that Mr. Montague, in his book, hath not affirmed anything to be the doctrine of the Church of England, but that which in our opinions is the doctrine of the Church of England, or agreeable thereunto. And for the preservation of the peace of the Church we in humility do conceive that his Majesty shall do most graciously to prohibit all parties, members of the Church of England, any further controverting of these questions by public preaching or writing, or any other way, for the disturbance of the peace of this Church for the time to come. And for anything that may further concern Mr. Montague's person in that business, we humbly commend him to his Majesty's gracious favour and pardon. And so we humbly recommend your Grace to the protection of the Almighty. Resting

Your Grace's faithful and humble Servants,

GEO. LONDON. [MONTAIGNE.]
R. DUNELM. [NEILE.]
LA. WINTON. D.C. [ANDREWES.]
J. ROFFENS. [BUCKERIDGE.]
GUIL. MENEVEN. [LAUD.]

From Winchester House,
January 16, 1625.

[u] [See Diary, Jan. 16, 1625.]

LETTER X.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Clarorum Virorum ad Vossium Epistt., Epist. lxxxii. p. 49; ad calc. Vossii Epist. Lond. 1690 [x].]

DOCTISSIME VIR,—Præbuisti gratissimam ansam, et aliquam prehendere mihi jamdiu in votis fuit. Quæ impediebant duo fuere; negotia plura, quam quibus par esse possum, et stylus inæqualis, et barbariem sonans; quem tamen, ob male jacta in me literarum fundamenta, nunquam satis limare potui. Compedes hosce, non solum candor tuus, sed et gratitudo mea abruperunt. Accepi litteras tuas, utinam scires quam charas, cum iis solos amoris tui libros, æternum eruditionis tuæ, et ære perennius monumentum, de Historicis Latinis. De Græcis quos edidisti Commentarios, apud me quidem illi sunt, et quod non plane perlegerim, me invitissimum distinuit negotiorum moles. Sed quod in amorem tui me rapuit, Historia fuit Pelagiana [y], Historia, non magis sæculis, quam affectibus Theologorum pugnantium diversis perplexa, seriatim tamen per ipsas laceras Ecclesias deducta, et in ipsis funestissimis Ecclesiasticorum dissidiis, non sine ingenii simul et laboris miraculo ordinata. Ad munus tuum redeo; gratiasque ago multiplices, quod tam eruditum opus, tam utile, nostrum, i. Britannicum, adoptione feceris. Quod tam justis laudibus Academiam florentissimam Cantabrigiam apud aures æquissimas placuit celebrare. Quod me dignum voluisti simul, nomine, inscriptione, libro, literis tuis. Præcipue vero, quod Buckinghamiæ Illustrissimum Ducem, omni virtutem genere cultissimum, et mihi omnis officii nomine observandissimum, tantis, debitis tamen, laudibus, posteris consecrasti [z]. Ego jam Duci paro literas, a me (et forte primo) audiet quid calamo tuo debet. Unum rogo; noli me in lineis hisce turbatis nimium quærere, alibi habito, rerum non verborum servus. Et quum Erpenius tuus [x], et Wintoniensis meus [a] fatis cessere, ipsi meritis suis immor-

[x] [Hæc Epistola, magna vero sui parte mutila, exstat inter 'Præstantium ac Eruditorum Virorum Epistolas,' p. 727. Amst. 1684.]

[y] [Historiæ de Controversiis, quas Pelagius, ejusque reliquiæ moverunt, libri septem.]

[z] [Thomas Erpenius Linguarum Orientalium apud Leidenses Professor, qui fatis cesserat, Nov. 13, 1624.]

[a] [Lancelotus Andrewes Episc. Winton. qui mortem obierat Sept. 25 1626.]

tales, socias jungamus manus, meas licet multo breviores invenias. Pater benedictionum sit cumulus tuus, et ego interim servus tibi in Christo, et, si placeat nomen, amicus,

GUIL. BATHON. ET WELLENSIS.

Ex Aula Regia
Hampton. Sept. 25, 1627.

LETTER XI.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Ibid. Epist. xc. p. 57.]

Guilielmus Bathonensis et Wellensis G. J. Vossio.

Aliam datam mihi occasionem ad te scribendi, Vir doctissime, libenter accipio. Et certe gaudeo (etiamsi undique mole negotiorum gravatus) hanc opportunitatem mihi se obtulisse. Non diu est, ex quo literas tuas gratissimas accepi, una cum Historicis Latinis a te nova vita donatis[b]. Ego statim acceptis libro literisque, literas ad te dedi calamo sane obeso, et per desuetudinem titubante. Unum in tua illa pereleganti et gravissima Epistola Duci Illustrissimo nuperrime nuncupata invitus legi, scilicet, te suasu tuorum et pollicitis Reipublicæ illius animum tuum mutasse, et proinde cœlum non mutaturum, nec accessum nunc ad nos te paraturum. Sed quod in hac re tibi placuit, mihi lex sit. Nolo sperare, quod non vis. Interim Dux Buckinghamiæ (qui Deo gratias apud nos iterum salvus[c]) amore et tuo, et tui captus, omnes meditatur vias, quibus te pari honore, quo tu illum, afficiat. Remora munificentissimæ gratitudinis nulla, nisi quod prorsus nescit, quod potissimum eligere debeat, in quo tibi beneficiat. Et hoc ut ego tibi scriberem in mandatis dedit. Officium (etsi difficilius scribo literas) mihi gratissimum. Nunc iterum vel hanc ob rem doleo te exuisse animum ad nos accedendi. Potuisset enim heroicus animus majora, quam nunc apud vos potest. Unum restat, ut te ostendas dextrum fortunæ tuæ fabrum, et prudenter excogites, quid tibi factum velis; sit quale optare fas est (novi enim, ni tua me fallant scripta, ingenium tuum) et factum

[b] [Vide supra, p. 250.]

[c] [Ab Insula Reaco nuper redux.]

puta. Forte deliberandum esse de re ipsa judices. Deliberet; tamen hoc unum peto, ut præsenti quam fieri possit responso certiorem me facias literas has ad manus tuas pervenisse[d]. Scio enim Ducem, candoris tui cultorem eximium, responsum expectare, quod (si fieri possit) literas hasce meas anteverteret. Quod reliquum est, preces, oro, effundas pro peccatrice anima

Devinctissimi tui in communi

Salvatore Jesu Christo,

GUIL. BATHON. ET WELLENSIS.

Decemb. 22, 1627.

LETTER XII.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Præst. ac Erudit. Virorum Epistt., Epist. cccliv. p. 729. Amst. 1684[e].]

Guilielmus Bathonensis et Wellensis G. J. Vossio.

Non profiteor, Vir clarissime, me hisce ad tuas, quas mihi tradidit vir tui studiosissimus Dominus Carltonus[f], responsum dare. Sunto tantum characteres amoris mei, qui nec te negligere, nec illum sine literis novit dimittere. Quum duobus ab hinc mensibus, Majestatem Regiam, ut mihi pro officio incumbit, infausto pede sequor (iter tum faciebat Hamptoniam) rheda egressus, torrentem non quatuor pedes latum dum transilio pede, inæquali planta in terram sabulosam, et minus fidam, incidente, nervum posteriorem tibiæ dextræ (Tendonem vocant) fregi[g]. Ab eo tempore incedo claudus; nec adhuc constat, quando sim vires pristinas recuperaturus. Si quæras, quorsum hæc? Ut certior fias, nactum te esse amicum claudum. Sed etsi nunc fractis nervis, non possum in gratiam tuam, quæ tu, quæ ego cupio, facere: quamprimum tamen vires accreverint, strenuo mihi concredita peragam. Ut sic intelligas, (saltem si quid possim,) me

[d] [Vide Vossii Responsum, apud Vossii Epist., Epist. lxxxi. p. 115.]

[e] [Exstat item apud Clarorum Virorum ad Vossium Epist., Epist. xcii. p. 58.]

[f] [Dudleius Carletonus, Eq. Aurat. hoc tempore Legati officio apud provincias Belgii fœderatas fungens.]

[g] [Vide Diarium, Feb. 5, 1627.]

ima tantum mei parte, non corde, non affectibus claudicare. Literis meis proximis meliora forsan ad te perferentur. Quod in votis est

Amicissimi tui,

GUIL. BATHON. ET WELLENSIS.

Martii 26, 1628.

LETTER XIII.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Ibid., Epist. cccclvii. pp. 731, 732.]

Guilielmus Episcopus Londinensis Vossio, S. P.

Literæ tuæ mihi semper gratissimæ ad me pervenerunt[h] salvo conductu D. Stewarti[i], qui una cum honoratissimo Domino, Domino Carltono, vobis nuperrime inservivit. Tradidit ille mihi una cum litteris librum Thesium tuarum, monumentum eximium. Imperfectum dicis, sed simul polliceris te eum et auctiorem et ampliorem jamjam ex schedis tuis latitantibus in lucem producturum. Nomine certe Ecclesiæ gaudeo et tuo; quam illa utilitatem, tu vero honorem sis inde percepturus. Et eo magis gaudeo, quia per litteras certior factus sum, aliquos nominis tui, apud Oxonienses, cultores Theses tuas, nec omnes, nec, ut vereor, perfectas, zelo parum prudenti typis mandare non statuisse modo sed et incepisse. Ego, ne quid esset simul tuum et imperfectum, curavi quantum potui, ne sic luci se ostenderent, et factum spero. Scripsi enim te perfecta volumina editurum.

De Baronio quod moliri instituis inprimis laudo; præcipue vero quod fixum habeas minutias non consectari. Certe in opere tam diffuso, nimis longum iter esset per minutias, et quod tædio afficeret et peritos viatores et festinantes. Caput rei est, illa in quibus longe a primitiva Ecclesia Romana recessit, brevibus ostendere, et argumentis insolubilibus demonstrare; quæ utraque tibi factu facilia semper æstimavi. De lingua etiam Latina commentarios tuo, id est suo, tempore expectabo[k], et quod opto spero, fore te ibi, sicut in aliis, sæculi hujus, et ignorantiæ quorundam superciliosæ vindicem, &c.

[h] [Vide Vossii Epist., Epist. lxxxiv. p. 117.]

[i] [Rich. Stewart, de quo plura alibi.]

[k] [Hoc opus tandem prodiit, sub titulo sequenti, 'Etymologicum Linguæ Latinæ,' &c.]

Pollicitus sum, &c. Filium tuum e multis felicibus unum, &c. mitte, si placet. Jube memorem esse honoris Dei et tui. Dux Buckinghamiæ, ut in alumnum Collegii alicujus adscribatur, et ubi quam minimo sumptu tuo studiis fruatur, effectum dabit. Ego etiam pater, tua venia, filio tuo futurus, si Deus annos meos labentes proroget, et filius tuus patris vestigiis insistat. Præterea illustr. Dux, ne te in filio tuo tantum videatur colere, aliud addit beneficium, &c. Windesoriæ Canonicatum, &c.

Infortunium meum, &c., grave fuit et adhuc hæret, &c. Adhuc inter claudos recensendus sum, &c., possum baculi ope gressus licet tardiores promovere. Nec parti læsæ incumbit ulterius dolor, sed tantum infirmitas. Erit autem illa quotidianus hospes usque ad annum revolutum. Si tum placeat discedere, gratus erit agilitatis quondam meæ tanquam a postliminio reditus; si non, optabo animum corpore in claudo rectum, et serviam necessitati libere.

Habes quæ in re tua multis aliter impeditus hactenus potui efficere. Perficiam quæ pro amore et viribus possum. Salutem vero meam, tum animæ, tum corporis, precibus tuis commendatam cupio; tuam vota mea semper prosequentur. Unum doleo; negotiis undique implicatus, factus sum a libris meis, quos unice sub Deo colui, pene exsul. Quod te scire velim, ne me inter vel studiosos posthæc nominare digneris. Valeas diu precatur

Tibi omni cultu addictissimus,

GUIL. LONDON.

Julii 14, 1628.

Postscriptum.—Mora injecta est litteris meis non sine bono tuo, et gaudeo scisse me, priusquam missæ illæ. Mutavit rex propositum de Canonicatu Windesoriæ, et de Cantuariensi nunc cogitavit. Præponderat hic illum quadraginta libris annuatim ad minimum, &c. Quod ad Theses tuas attinet, frustrato conatu meo, Oxoniæ vel Bellositi Dobunorum excusæ in publicum exierunt, &c.[1]

Iisdem fide et amore tuus,

GUIL. LONDON.

August 5, 1628.

[1] [Theses Theologicæ et Historicæ de variis Doctrinæ Christianæ Capitibus, &c. Bellositi. 1628.]

LETTER XIV.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Clarorum Virorum ad Vossium Epistt., Epist. xcviii. p. 62[m].]

Guilielmus Londinensis G. J. Vossio.

Binas literas tuas accepi, utrasque post fata Illustrissimi Ducis Buckinghamiæ. Utræque tamen de illo silent. Priores putavi ideo tacuisse, quia ad aures tuas tam cruenta mors non pervenisset. Sed prorsus obstupui, quum secundas attulit filius etiam elingues. Quid est? Num fama desiit esse velox? Num mare non ita spatiosum inter nos vosque tardius prætervolat? Num cruor, crudeli infernali dextra effusus, et viscus famæ pennas impedivit? Imo accelerat sanguis, clamatque eundo. Aliud proculdubio est, prorsus aliud, quod de re tam barbara, de persona tam illustri, de fato tam subito, eligis tacere. Nolo plura, ne iterum cordis mei fontes rumpant repagula, et effundant spiritus. Mortuus est, cui ego, tuque multum debuimus.

Priores literæ tuæ nimium mihi ascribunt. Nec enim is sum, cui aut illa debentur elogia, aut cui tu tantum debes. Ducis memoriæ, non minus quam nomini agnosce te debere, et sufficit. De Musis, a quibus incipis[n], sunt certe ante omnia dulces, sed de Dominabus et Musis ipsis intelligi volo, de ancillis non item. Illæ enim sunt quæ Absinthium miscent, utpote non naturales Musarum pedissequæ. Ipsæ enim optant, eligunt alias; vi, et infelicitate temporum nunquam satis deploranda, hæ obtruduntur illis.

Posteriores literæ[o] post immeritissimas laudes descendunt in charissimum pignus tuum, filium natu maximum[p]. Quod expectavi secundum, fecit non optio mea, ubi omnes pariter ignoti; sed in memoria erat quod amicus tuus D. Dudleius Carltonus insinuavit. Quum aliud tibi consultius visum sit, primogenitum æque mihi charum advenisse scito, etiam non adhibitis rationibus illis, quæ tamen ipsæ per se abunde sunt ad suadendum.

[m] [Exstat item, magna vero sui parte mutila, apud Præst. ac Erud. Viror. Epistt., Epist. cccclx. p. 734.]

[n] [Vide G. J. Vossii Epist. lxxxviii. p. 120. Lond. 1690.]

[o] [Epist. xciv. pp. 129, 130.]

[p] [Joannem Vossium.]

Unum est, de quo quid dicam adhuc nescio. Scribis filium tuum, præter progressus in Mathesi, et Scientia Naturali, animum tandem appulisse ad Juris scientiam, et in ea Baccalaurei gradum consecutum esse. Timeo, ne hoc ei impedimento esse possit, quominus cooptetur in alicujus Collegii Societatem, si forte per statuta id exigatur, ut non Graduatus sit tempore admissionis; spero tamen hoc non esse omnibus Collegiis commune. Ego (quod potui) statim scripsi, et spero proxima septimana tale responsum me accepturum, ut filius tuus Academiæ Cantabrigiensi gratissimus hospes sit futurus, quod postea facile poteris et a me et a filio audire. Si nactus aliquando fuerit societatem, necesse est, ut Academiæ Collegiique statutis obtemperet, et ad gradus ulteriores tardius quam pro meritis promoveatur, si mores loci jubeant. De sumptibus abunde est, quod promittis, nec minimæ mihi curæ erit, quam primum possum de iis minuendis cogitare.

Mitto tibi Theses tuas Oxonii excusas, a quarum editione utinam abstinuissent Oxonienses mei, sic vota tua meis consona sunt. Qua fide, qua diligentia publicas fecerint, ipse ex hoc exemplari judicare poteris, sed amore, audeo dicere, fecerunt quodcunque factum. Tu tamen quod polliceris facito. Prodeat editio tua. Et ut scias me legisse aliqua (omnia enim nondum otium erat) velim præcipue ea quæ a te juniore prodierunt, oculo haud nimis facili ipse jam perlegas, emendesque, si forte aliquid occurrat, quod te judice a veneranda sanaque simul antiquitate deviet. Quod mihi leviter percurrenti factum videtur in capite de Baptismo Johannis. Neque enim Patres me docuere undique idem fuisse cum Christi Baptismate. Boni consule libertatem hominis amicissimi. Et quid si aliquantulum differas editionem illam a te distinctam, donec ipse, nunc multo maturior, dicas; Eat liber hic priscissimæ Antiquitatis æmulus.

Consilium tuum de Baptismo, una cum Historia Rituum Antiquorum, valde probo. Oro tamen, ne omittas quod de Baronio scripsisti. Unum cave. Vides iterum libertatem meam. Nam libros quinque de antiquis Baptismi Ritibus, Cæremoniisque scripsit Josephus Vicecomes[q]. Quod cum

[q] [Titulus hujus libri ita se habet, 'Observationes ecclesiasticæ; de Baptismo et Confirmatione, de antiquis Missæ Ritibus.' Mediol. 1615—26.]

te latere non possit, curabis scio, ut superior sis in illo argumento. Velim enim nihil sub nomine tuo prodeat, nisi Vossio meo dignissimum, et par Historiæ Pelagianæ.

Redeo ad infandos dolores, quibus intime premor ob Ducis Illustrissimi cædem, omni sæculo dolendam. Parricida ille scelestissimus, Gentis et Religionis dedecus, eripuit non mihi tantum, sed et tibi charissimum caput, et (non obstantibus iis, quibus eum denigravit hominum quorundam malitia) utrisque et animi et corporis dotibus ditissimum. Cœlum non dubito petiit ille. Terrarum incolæ, quos Astræa reliquit, nos adhuc sumus. Damna exinde tua cogita, mea infinita sunt. Pecuniam statuit tibi mittere statim a reditu; periit cum illo illa. Decrevit certo certius omnia in usum filii tui paratissima habere. Non dico periisse hoc, sed quod ego possum multo minus est. Diploma Canonicatus tui in Ecclesia Cantuariensi ille a Rege serenissimo impetravit, munivissetque contra quoscunque impugnatores. Ego et hic tibi non deero, nisi potestas mihi defuerit.

Nunc accipe stigmata anni hujus, mihi inauspicatissimi. Ineunte anno (quod nosti) tendonem fregi, et adhuc incedo claudus. Successit Concio, ineunte Parliamento, mihi tum admodum infirmo a Rege imposita[r], opus (prout res nostræ se tum habuere) periculosum simul et difficile. Postea Dux Buckinghamiæ mihi charissimus, nescio quo fato, et cum illo ipse, haud plane amico usi sumus conventu illo[s]. Finito eo, ille miserrime est non sine Diabolo occisus. Post multa suspiria (nam vere et sine teste dolui) morbum contraxi acrem, a quo vixdum convalui[t]. Servi quatuor variis morbis lassati, quintus a Pleuritide cæsus. Et nescio quid minatur portio anni infausti futura. Sed Deus est cui servio, qui tecum sit gratia speciali, et cum tuis: prout precatur

Tui amantissimus

GUIL. LONDINENSIS.

Octob. 25, 1628.

---

[r] [Vide Diarium, Mar. 17, 1627.] [s] [Ibid. Junii 14, 1628.] [t] [Ibid. Sept. 27.]

LETTER XV.

TO JAMES USSHER, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.

[Parr's Life of Ussher, Letter cxxxiv. p. 401.]

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I have received your Grace's second letters, and with them letters from Dr. Barlow,[u] a man known to me only by name and good report. I have, upon receipt of these, a second time humbly presented Dr. Barlow's suit to his Majesty, with all fair representation to his Majesty of the necessity of a good *commendam* to the Archbishop of Tuam; and though in my judgment I hold it very unfit, and of ill both example and consequence in the Church, to have a Bishop, much more an Archbishop, retain a deanery *in commendam*, yet, because there is (as I am informed) much service to be done for that Archbishop, and because I have conceived this man will do that service (for so he hath assumed); and because much of that service must be done at Dublin, where that deanery will the better fit him, as well for house as charge; and because it is no new thing in that country to hold a deanery with a bishopric; I made bold to move his Majesty for it, and his Majesty is graciously pleased to grant it; and I have already, by his Majesty's special command, given order to Sir Hen. Holcroft to send letters to my Lord Deputy to this purpose.

But these two things his Majesty commanded me to write to your Lordship: the one, that young men be not commended to him for Bishops; the other, that he shall hardly be drawn again to grant a deanery *in commendam*. Any other preferment, though of more value, he shall be content to yield. I am glad I have been able to serve your Grace's desires in this business. And for Dr. Barlow, I wish him joy; but must desire your Lordship to excuse my not writing to him; for between Parliament and Term, I have not leisure. So I leave you to the grace of God, and shall ever rest

Your Grace's loving Friend and Brother,

Jan. 29, 1628. GUIL. LONDON.

My Lord Archbishop of York[x], Dr. Barlow's tutor that was, is of my judgment for holding a deanery *in commendam*.

[u] [Randolph Barlow, of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, afterwards Archdeacon of Winchester. He was now appointed Archbishop of Tuam.]

[x] [Samuel Harsnet, formerly Fellow of Pembroke Hall.]

LETTER XVI.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Claror. Viror. ad Vossium Epistt., Epist. ciii. p. 65[y].]

Guilielmus Londinensis Ger. Johan. Vossio suo.

Quod tam sero ad aures tuas pervenerat Stygium facinus, et fatum Ducis illustrissimi, haud dubito, miror magis[z]. Sed occlusos tunc temporis portus nostros fuisse serius ipse reminiscor; et dolor sic amissi Ducis, necnon mutata, aut saltem mutanda (ut sperabatur) rerum facies, quæ in fragili memoria scripta erant facile deleverunt. Quod restat nunc sola patientia est, ut ferendo leviora fiant, quæ nec ferre didicit ingenuitas, nec discutere facultas erat. Quiescit in pace anima, qua terræ indignissimæ, ipsa cœlo dignissima. Clarescet, spero, post sæculi invidiam virtus, quam deprimere non potuit rabies plusquam Scythica; denigrare tantum potuit lingua rabida. Tu age, quod spondes, et (quo solo modo gratus esse potes) nomen Ducis in se clarum, posteris clarius tradere, ne totus uno ictu infernali periisse videatur.

De filio tuo quod scribam nihil aut parum habeo. Antea significavi quam inopportunus adventus fuit. Omnia tamen, prout tum fieri potuit, molitus sum, quo nihil ei moræ esse posset, aut scrupulum injiceret, se in gentem incultam advenisse, aut in amicos dubios incidisse. Cantabrigiæ jam est, in Collegio S. Petri, et Doctori Wrenno[a] curæ. Quæ restant, suo tempore præstabo, si potero. Et scio Wrennum, nunc Vice-Cancellarium Cantabrigiensem, esse et filii tui amicum, et nominis tui cultorem.

Gaudeo te Thesium tuarum syllogen accepisse, et Academiam Oxoniensem, quoniam edere voluit, non penitus inemendate edidisse. Sed de Thesibus aliquibus omittendis, nempe quia in opere Historiæ Pelagianæ, et quidem emendatius, legantur, sicut consilium eorum non fuit, ita nec tuum norunt. Nec sub quocunque prætextu, hoc illis, opinor, licuisset.

De Baptismo Joh. mihi abunde est, quod scribis. Et

[y] [Exstat item, magna vero sui parte mutila, apud Præst. et Erud. Viror. Epistt., Epist. ccccliv. p. 736.]

[z] [Vide G. J. Vossii Epist. xcvii. pp. 132, 133.]

[a] [Matthæo Wren, postea Episc. Heref., Norvic. et Eliensi.]

utinam licuisset ubique, aut, quia illud non sperandum, utinam alicubi licuisset, apte sententiam vetustatis exponere, sapiat illa hominibus, sive non sapiat. Sed in illa tempora mihi certe incidisse videtur Christiana philosophia, ut de ea nec loqui, nec tacere quis tuto possit. Et quam care libertatem illam, qua in alia causa, non sine summo Ecclesiæ bono, usus es, redemeris, facile conjicio. Tanti tamen tibi constitisse nunc in novissimis literis primo legi. Adjicerem hic alia, sed est quod prohibet.

De Josepho Vicecomite admonui tantum, et per amorem[b]. Et magna me lætitia afficit, te ita vestigia ejus premere, ut simul antecedas. Nec dolori tibi sit, labores si forte tui spissius (ut loqueris) prodeunt. Negotia publica, privata, uxor, filii, amici, aliquam tui partem vendicant, ea lege natus es, sed utinam de tua uxorisque valetudine lætiora propediem audiam, et diu vivas ad Batavorum tuorum gloriam, et Reip. Christianæ emolumentum. Mihi tendo fere coaluit, ita tamen ut pristinæ sanitatis sit spes perexigua. Deo interim quotidianas ago gratias, quod vel sic uti crure liceat. Literis meis per omnia responsum dedisti, præterquam quod de Baronio nihil. Nolo sic prætermittere quod summum est; tu id age, ne quid aliud impediat animadversiones illas. Ecce rogator importunus accedo, id age, ut sic tandem Ecclesiæ non desit Historia sua, neve accedat quæ sua non est; si hoc velis, et breviter, potes enim, sacer mihi eris Apollo.

Vale.

Tuus,

GUIL. LONDON.

Maii 10, 1629.

LETTER XVII.

TO JAMES USSHER, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.

[Parr's Life, Letter cxlii. pp. 409, 410.]

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I am glad Mr. Bedell's preferment[c] gives your Grace such contentment. Your former letter came safe to my hands; so did your second. I see nothing is so well done, but exceptions can fret it; for I hear that which I looked not for concerning Mr. Bedell's preferment,

[b] [Vide supra, p. 256.]

[c] [The Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, to be Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh. He was consecrated Sept. 13]

whose name was never put to the King till both the other competitors were refused by his Majesty as too young.

Ardagh is not forgotten in the letter: for since upon receipt of your Lordship's last letters, I spoke with Sir Hen. Holcroft about it.

Beside those of your Lordship's, I have received letters from Mr. Bedell, and from the Fellows, about their freedom of election of a Provost. My Lord, his Majesty would fain have a man to go on where Mr. Bedell leaves. I am engaged for none. I heartily love freedoms granted by charter, and would have them maintained. If they will return which are come hither; and all agree, or a major part, upon a worthy man that will serve God and the King, I will give them all the assistance I can to keep their privilege whole.

The King likes wondrous well of the Irish lecture begun by Mr. Bedell, and the course of sending such young men as your Grace mentions. I hope before our Committee for the establishment of Ireland end, I shall find a time to think of the remedy your Lordship proposes about scandalous ministers; in which, or any other service, I shall not be wanting. For the particulars concerning Clark, I have your enclosed; and if he stir anything while I am present, you shall be sure I will do you right.

Now, my Lord, I have answered all your letter, save about the Archbishopric of Cassils for the old Dean[d]. I have done all I am able for that reverend and well-deserving gentleman; but the King's Majesty hath been possessed another way; and it seems, upon like removes hereafter will move more than one. And at this time he will give Cassils to my Lord of Clougher, if he will take it; and so go on with another to succeed him, of whom he is likewise resolved; and who shall be Cassils, if my Lord of Clougher refuse[e]. There is nothing which the Dean of Cassils can have at this time, unless he will, with a good *commendam*, be content to take Kilfanora. To which, though I do not persuade, yet I would receive his answer; and I add, it will be a step for him to a better. As for Bath, the Lord-elect that was, he

[d] [Lewis Jones. He was consecrated Bishop of Killaloe April 23, 1633, and died Nov. 2, 1646, aged 104 years.]

[e] [The Archbishopric of Cashel was vacant by the death of Malcolm Hamilton. His successor was Archibald Hamilton, Bishop of Killala and Achonry.]

hath lapsed it by not proceeding to consecration[f]. I must now humbly intreat your Grace to send me the names and values of all the bishoprics and deaneries in Ireland, and what bishoprics are joined to others, that I may be the better able to serve that Church, being as yet one of the Committee; and I pray you to excuse my not writing to Mr. Bedell, for, in truth, I have not leisure. So I leave you to the grace of God, and rest,

Your Grace's

Very loving Brother,

GUIL. LONDON.

June 16, 1629.

LETTER XVIII.

TO JAMES USSHER, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.

[Parr's Life, Letter cxliii. pp. 410, 411.]

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—The two Fellows of the College of Dublin, which are attendant here about the freedom of their election, were commanded by his Majesty to send to the College there, and to know whom they would pitch upon for their Governor. And his Majesty was content, upon the reasons given by me, and the petition of the Fellows, to leave them to freedom, so they did choose such a man as would be serviceable to the Church and him. Upon this, after some time, they delivered to the King that they would choose, or had chosen, Dr. Ussher[g], a man of your Grace's name and kindred. His Majesty thereupon referred them to the Secretary, the Lord Viscount Dorchester[h], and myself, to inform ourselves of his worth and fitness.

My Lord proposed that they should think of another man that was known unto us[i], that we might the better deliver our judgments to the King. I was very sensible of your Lordship's name in him, and remembered what you had written to me in a former letter concerning him; and there-

[f] [Leonard Maw had succeeded Laud in the see of Bath and Wells. He died Sept. 2, 1629.]

[g] [This was Dr. Robert Ussher, son of Henry Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh. He was cousin to James Ussher, the Primate. In 1635 he was consecrated Bishop of Kildare.]

[h] [Dudley Carleton, created Visc. Dorchester July 25, 1628.]

[i] [Laud was anxious at this time for the promotion of William Chappell, afterwards Provost. See Letter to Wentworth, March 11, 1635.]

upon prevailed with his Majesty that I might write these letters to you, which are to let your Grace understand that his Majesty puts so great confidence in your integrity and readiness to do him service, that he hath referred this business to the uprightness of your judgment, and will exercise his power accordingly. For thus he hath commanded me to write; That your Grace should presently upon receipt of these letters, write back to me what your knowledge and judgment is of the worth and fitness of Dr. Ussher for this place, setting all kindred and affection aside: and upon that certificate of yours, the King will leave them to all freedom of their choice, or confirm it if it be made[k]. So, wishing your Lordship all health and happiness, I leave you to the grace of God, and shall ever rest,

Your Grace's very loving Friend and Brother,

GUIL. LONDON.

London House, June 25, 1629.

LETTER XIX.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Præst. et Erudit. Viror. Epistt., Epist. cccclxxii. pp. 740, 741.]

Guilielmus Episcopus Londinensis Ger. Joan. Vossio, S. P.

Vir Clarissime, Quod scripturus ad patrem a filio initium sumam, ingratum tibi esse non potest, cui salus filii tui majoris pretii videtur quam tua; et video filium tuum te jam certiorem fecisse, literas a Seren. Maj. signatas et missas esse in hunc finem, ut ipse in locum Collegii Jesu proxime vacaturum adscriberetur. De hoc literæ meæ omnino siluerunt. Volui enim nihil scribere, donec aliquid præstitum viderem. Nunc velim scias me omnia præstitisse, quibus me

[k] [Dr. Elrington, in his Life of Archbishop Ussher (p. 101), records several documents relating to this subject; among others, a notice to the effect that the Fellows should advertise the King of the choice they had made; and the following suggestion by Laud: "June 26, 1629. I think it fit that a letter be prepared for his Majesty's signature, to give order to the Lord Deputy to give order accordingly to the College at Dublin to proceed to an election, after that my Lord Primate of Armagh hath certified his judgment of Dr. Ussher.—Guil. London."

The order for the admission of the Provost was not issued by the Lords Justices till the 13th of the following January.]

astrictum tenebat votum aut Ducis, aut proprium. Filius enim tuus, prout literæ regiæ voluerunt, jam socius est Collegii Jesu, quod ei tibique faustum felixque sit. Et forte hic etiam præcurrit filius tuus; a quo quidni hæc etiam ante scias? Nec mirum, si juvenis senem, sanus claudum, filius peregrinum præeat ad patrem. Nunc vero etiamsi filius domicilium mutavit, spero tamen nec amicos, nec animum, nec studia mutaturum; quod primo Dei gratia, dein tuis monitis facile factu erit. Transitus sic beatior futurus a S. Petro[1] ad Jesum.

Quod consulto a Baronio manum aliquantisper subduxisti, rationem nunc reddis. Voluere Proceres Partitiones Oratorias priores esse; volunt etiam et nunc commentarios. Quidni obtemperes? præsertim, quum, ut scribis, primus hic sit ingenii tui partus, quem Scaligerus, Casaubonus, aliique summi viri tantopere comprobarunt; quos quidem nunquam laudasset nobile illud par doctorum, nisi dignissimos luce judicassent. Sed audi. Ego etsi orator parum vehemens, nec dulcis tamen: etsi negotiis irretitus non solum artem illam, sed insimul omnes oblivioni tradere pene coactus sum; cupio certe videre, quæ tot et tanti viri calculo suo approbarunt, quæque tantum et tam limatum ingenium post eorum censuram maturo consilio ad incudem revocavit, ut auctius et perfectius emittat. Quin et videor mihi hoc jure vendicare. Nam quam sint hæ primitiæ tuæ, cur non mihi et has una cum primogenito concrederes? His autem in lucem emissis, spero te animadversionibus Baronianis vacaturum, saltem quantum potes. De Duce illustrissimo Buckinghamiæ, quem popularis furor abripuit, sæpius apud te quod sentiam, deposui; nec sine gaudio in epistolis tuis novissimis legi, illum æternum tibi amico sermone et scriptis celebrandum, ut alicubi saltem sui similis vel mortuus appareat. Eo autem magis laudo gratum tuum erga munificentissimum Mæcenatem animum, quia domi pariter et foras vapulat. Legisti, scio, P. Bertii Digestum Novum de Aggeribus et Pontibus ad mare exstructis. Qualis fuit vir ille (certe abunde doctus) apud vos tu melius nosti. Qualis et nunc est non ignoras scio. Dum religionem mutavit, forte impleta est Apostasia

[1] [Peterhouse, cui ante adscriptus.]

Sanctorum[m]. Hic illius operis cap. iv. mire in Buckinghamium invehitur. Quem et cap. xviii. incentorem vocat et Ducem omnium malorum. Quid male habet hominem? Quid in eum unquam molitus Buckinghamius? Sed forte Gallorum causam agit, apud quos nunc est. Interim ibi dum sævit in mortuos, in duplicem eadem pagina incidit errorem. Scribit enim Ducem a nobili Scoto confossum, quod ab ignobili Anglo factum fuit. Deinde narrat suffectum in ejus locum Essexium; cum non ille, sed Linseius vices ejus supplevit. Det Deus viro docto meliorem mentem. Ultimo loco scribis, accepisse te his diebus, et ab iis quibus res Britannicæ non ignotæ videntur, dissensum aliquem doctorum in controversia de Prædestinatione et dogmatis annexis, zelo quorundam improvido pene in schisma apud nos erupisse; et alia quæ postremi Parliamenti tempore me aliosque occupatos satis tenuerunt. Ego certe hæc omnia in præcedentibus literis meis consulto omisi. Partim quia ulcus fuit, quidquid attingerem, quod quia sanare non potui, fricare nolebam; partim quia nihil unquam minus placuit, quam nidum proprium fœdare. Quin et quia de Parliamento nihil volui nisi bonum (quod non semper de hoc passa est veritas) proferre. Præcipue vero silentii mei ratio hæc erat. Ne me, quem agitatum undique et petitum norunt omnes, aut iræ impotentem existimares, aut male ominantem patriæ aut Ecclesiæ audires, quod certe non deceret, et (quod olim Cicero) mallem multum alienæ quam nostræ. Sed quoniam vis aliqua, hæc accipe, quæ a corde sæpius vulnerato nunc stillant.

Omnem ego semper movi lapidem, ne publice scopulosæ illæ et perplexæ quæstiones coram populo tractarentur; ne pietatem et charitatem sub specie veri violaremus. Moderata semper suasi, ne fervida ingenia, et quibus religio non est summæ curæ, turbarent omnia. Nec forte hoc placuit; sed memini tamen quam serio suis Salvator charitatem commendavit. Quam caute patienterque voluit Apostolus cum infirmis agi. Si his artibus peream, factus inter litigantes victori (ut solet) præda, merces mea mecum, nec extra me, nisi in Deo, solatium quæram. Interim quæ spero pauciora

[m] [Respicit librum Bertii, cui titulus, 'De Apostasia Sanctorum.']

sunt, quæ timeo multa. Nec habet Reformata Ecclesia quod magis doleat caveatve, quam gladio undique apud alias gentes petita, ne apud nos vosque, ubi tutius degit, propriis manibus lacera, graviori scissura, in partes primo, deinde paullatim dividendo in minutias et sic in nihilum evanescat. Aliquid aliud est quod videor mihi prævidere. Sed orare melius est, ne fiat, quam prædicere faciendum. Nec enim hoc conditione propheta esse velim. Plura nolo, ne, dum deploranda tempora persequar, id dicam, quod imprimis cupio neminem scisse. De me hoc unum te scire velim. Deo propitio dabo operam, ut veritas et pax se invicem exosculentur. Si præ peccatis nostris id nolit Deus, sperabo ipse quam primum pacem æternam; osculum vero dirimentes Deo, suo tempore aut convertendos, quod opto, aut castigandos relinquens.

Jussu Serenissimi Regis, sed opera mea et Episcopi Eliensis[n], conciones viri apud nos doctissimi et sanctissimi Præsulis nuper Wintoniensis[o], plurimæ in lucem prodierunt, sed quia lingua nostra vernacula scriptæ, nolui ad te transmittere. Aliud volumen, minus illud quidem et multo, quia aliqua habet lingua nobis cum aliis communi, nunc una cum his literis ad te mitto[p]. Quædam continet quæ volui te videre. Excusatas habe rudiores has et oblongiores literas; otium non fert, ut sæpius te sic lassarem. Valeat dignitas tua, et in omnibus orationibus tuis sis memor, prout necessitates meæ postulant,

Amicissimi tibi,

GUIL. LONDON.

Julii 14, 1629.

LETTER XX.

TO JAMES USSHER, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.

[Parr's Life, Letter cxlviii. pp. 415, 416.]

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I have received two or three letters from you since I writ you any answer. I hope your Grace is not of opinion that it is either idleness or neglect which have made me silent; for the plain truth is, I fell into a fierce burning fever, August the 14th[q], which held me above

[n] [Johannis Buckeridge.]

[o] [Lanceloti Andrewes.]

[p] [Opuscula scil. posthuma Lanceloti Andrewes.]

[q] [See Diary at that date.]

three weeks. It was so fierce that my physicians, as well as my friends, gave me for dead, and it is a piece of a miracle that I live. I have not yet recovered my wonted strength, and God knows when I shall; yet, since I was able to go to the Court, though not to wait there, I have done as much business as I could, and I think as your Grace hath desired of me, for the Church of Ireland, as your Lordship will see by this brief account following.

And first, my Lord, I have obtained of his Majesty the new incorporating of the Dean and Chapter of Derry[r], and I think the Dean is returned[s]. At the same time, the King was pleased to give order for confirming the election of Dr. Ussher to be Governor of the College in Dublin[t]. Thirdly, upon the refusal of my Lord of Clougher[u], his Majesty gave, in the time of my sickness, the Archbishopric of Cassills to the Bishop of Killally[x], and the Bishopric of Killally to the Dean of Rapho[y]. And whereas your Grace, in the close of one of your letters, did acquaint me, that there was a fear, lest some cunning would be used to beg or buy some patronages out of the King's hands; I moved his Majesty about that likewise, and he made me a gracious promise that he would part with none of them. And now, my Lord, I give your Lordship thanks for the catalogue of the Bishoprics of Ireland, which I heartily desire your Grace to perfect, as occasion may be offered you. And for the last business (as I remember), concerning the table of Tithing in Ulster, I have carefully looked it over; but by reason I have no experience of those parts, I cannot judge clearly of the business; but I am taking the best care I can about it, and when I have done, I will do my best with his Majesty for confirmation, and I leave Mr. Hygate to report the particulars to your Grace. I have observed that Kilfanora is no fertile ground, it is let lie so long fallow[z]. Hereupon I have adventured to

[r] [This new incorporation was granted March 3, 1629–30. The patent was surrendered Dec. 31, 1631, and a second was granted on the 7th of March following. See Cotton's Fasti Hibenici, vol. iii. p. 328.]

[s] [Henry Sutton, M.A. He was appointed by name in the new charter. Ibid. p. 331.]

[t] [This confirmation was issued Nov. 15. See Elrington's Life of Ussher, p. 102.]

[u] [James Spottiswood.]

[x] [Archibald Hamilton.]

[y] [Archibald Adair.]

[z] [Kilfenora had been vacant since the translation of John Steere to the see of Ardfert in 1622.]

move his Majesty, that some one or two good benefices lying not too far off, or any other Church preferment without cure, so it be not a Deanery, may be not for this time only, but for ever annexed to that Bishopric. The care of managing that business he refers to your Grace, and such good counsel in the law as you shall call to your assistance. And I pray your Grace think of it seriously and speedily; and though I doubt you will find nothing actually void to annex unto it, yet if that act be but once past, the hope of that which is annexed will make some worthy man venture upon that pastoral charge; and so soon as you are resolved what to do, I pray send me word, that so I may acquaint his Majesty with it, and get power for you to do the work. These are all the particulars that for the present I can recall out of your letters, sent unto me in the time of my sickness. So with my hearty prayers for your health and happiness, and that you may never be pushed in such a fire as I have been, I leave you to the grace of God, and rest,

Your Grace's loving poor Friend
and Brother,
GUIL. LONDON.

London House, Dec. 7th, 1629.

LETTER XXI.

TO THE ARCHDEACON OF LONDON.

[Prynne's Cant. Doom, pp. 371, 372.]

SIR,—These are to let you understand, that his Majesty, out of his royal and princely care that the government of the Church may be carefully looked unto by the Bishops, and others with whom it is trusted, hath lately sent certain instructions to my Lord's Grace of Canterbury, and of York, to be by them dispersed to the several Bishops of each diocese within their provinces; to the intent, that whatsoever concerns any Bishop personally, or otherwise, in reference to those of the clergy they are to govern, may be by every of them readily and carefully performed. The instruc-

tions which concern the persons to be governed, are only, the third, for keeping the King's Declaration, that so differences and questions may cease; and the fifth, about lecturers; and the seventh, concerning private chaplains in other houses of men not qualified; and the eighth, about either recusants, or any other that absent themselves from church and Divine service[a]. All the rest are personal to the Bishops; yet because they are so full of justice, honour, and care of the Church, I send to you the whole body of the Instructions, as they came to me, praying and requiring you, as Archdeacon of London, to send me, at or before the Wednesday, the third day of February next, both the Christian and surnames of every lecturer within your Archdeaconry, as well in places exempt as not exempt, and the place where he preacheth, and his quality and degree. As also the names of such men as, being not qualified, keep chaplains in their houses. And these are further to pray, and, in his Majesty's name, to require you, that you leave with the parson and vicar of the place, a copy, not of all, but of the four Instructions mentioned, with the four several branches belonging to the lecturers, with a charge, that the parson or vicar deliver another copy of them to the churchwardens; and that you do not only call upon them for performance now presently, but also take a great care from time to time, that at the end of your next visitation, and so forward at the end of every several visitation, I may, by yourself or your officials, have true notice how they are performed, and where, and by whom, they are disobeyed. For so much my Lord's Grace of Canterbury requires of me, as you shall see by the tenor of his Grace's letters to me here inclosed. I pray you, in any case, not to fail in this; for if you should, when I come to give up my account, I must discharge myself upon you; and that neglect would make me to go backward in his Majesty's favour, besides whatsoever else may follow. Thus not doubting of your fidelity in this behalf, I leave you to the grace of God; and shall so rest

Your very loving Friend,

WILL. LONDON.

Jan. 4, 1629.

[a] [The Injunctions referred to are given by Prynne, Cant. Doom, p. 370.]

LETTER XXII.

TO JAMES USSHER, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.

[Parr's Life, Letter cliv. pp. 426, 427.]

My very good Lord,—I thank your Grace heartily for your letters, especially for the preface of this your last. It is true, my Lord, God hath restored me, even from death itself, for I think no man was further gone, and scaped. And your Grace doth, very Christian-like, put me in mind, that God having renewed my lease, I should pay him an income of some service to his Church; which I hope, in the strength of His grace, I shall ever be willing and sometime able to perform. I have not yet recovered the great weakness into which my sickness cast me; but I hope, when the spring is come forward, my strength will increase, and enable me to service.

In the meantime, my Lord, as weak as I have been, I have begun to pay my fine; but what the sum comes to, God knows, is very little. Your table of the Tithes of Ulster, and the business concerning the impropriations, are both past; and concerning both, I leave myself to Mr. Hygate's report.

As touching the Deanery of Armagh, I am glad to hear that any place of preferment in that kingdom hath so good means of subsistence without tithes. But I must needs acquaint your Grace, that neither my Lord of Winchester[b], that now is, nor Dr. Lindsell[c], did ever acquaint me with your Grace's purpose of drawing Johannes Gerardus Vossius into those parts; had I known it in time, the business might have been easier than now it will be.

For first, upon an attempt made, by the Lord Brook[d], to bring Vossius into England to be a reader in Cambridge, the States allowed him better maintenance, and were unwilling to have him come; and himself was not very willing, in regard of his wife and many children, being loth to bring them from all their kindred and friends into a strange place. And if he were unwilling, upon these grounds, to come into England, I doubt whether he will venture to Ireland or no.

[b] [Richard Neile, translated to York, Oct. 1632.]

[c] [Augustine Lindsell, Dean of Peterborough, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough and Hereford.]

[d] [Robert Greville, see vol. iii. p. 241.]

But, secondly, my Lord; since this, my Lord Duke in his lifetime procured him of his Majesty the reversion of a Prebend in Canterbury, which is since fallen[e]; and Vossius came over into England in the time of my infirmity, and was installed, and I was glad I had the happiness to see him. After he had seen both the Universities, he returned home again; and, within these two days, I received a letter from him of the safety of his return thither[f]. The Church of Canterbury, notwithstanding his absence, allow him an hundred pounds a year, as they formerly did to Mr. Casaubon[g]. Now, I think, the Prebend of Canterbury (would he have been Priest, and resided upon it) would have been as much to him as the Deanery of Armagh. But, howsoever, my Lord the King having given him that preferment already, will hardly be brought to give him another, especially considering what I could write unto you, were it fit. Nevertheless, out of my love to the work you mention, if you can prevail with Vossius to be willing, and that it may appear the Deanery of Armagh will be of sufficient means for him and his numerous family, if your Grace then certify me of it, I will venture to speak, and do such offices as shall be fit.

And now, my Lord, for your own business. Mr. Archibald Hamilton, who, it seems, by your Grace's letters, is your agent here, hath not as yet been with me; but, whensoever he shall come, he shall be very welcome; and I hope your Grace knows, I will be very ready to do that Church and you the best service I can. As I had written thus far, Mr. Hamilton came to me; so that now I shall inform myself, as well as I can, of your Lordship's business, which, he tells me, is perplexed by some to whom it was formerly referred. His Majesty is now going to Newmarket, so that till his return, little or nothing can be done; but so soon as he comes back, I will not be wanting to that part which shall be laid upon me.

I formerly writ to your Grace about divers businesses, and I have received your answer to the most of them,

[e] [This was the eleventh Stall. On the Duke's promise to Vossius, see above, p. 257.]

[f] [This letter does not appear to have been preserved.]

[g] [Isaac Casaubon was admitted Prebendary of Canterbury, Feb. 1611. Several letters addressed to him by Benjamin Carrier, respecting the value of his Prebend, are printed in the notes to Casaubon's Ephemerides, pp. 1183 seq.]

only to one particular you have answered nothing, which makes me think that letter scarce came safe to your hands. It is about the Bishopric of Kilfanora, which is so poor in itself, that no man asks it of the King; and his Majesty is graciously pleased that your Lordship would think of some good parsonage, or vicarage, or donative, that might for ever be annexed unto it. And though nothing be now perchance actually void to fit this purpose, yet I conceive the annexation may be presently made, though the profit arising from the thing come not to the Bishop till it become void. I pray your Grace take as much care of this as possibly you can, and let me hear from you what may be done.

This letter, my Lord, is a great deal too long; but so many occasions would not suffer it to be shorter. I wish you all health, and so leave you to the grace of God, ever resting

Your Grace's loving poor Friend and Brother,

GUIL. LONDON.

Lond. House, Feb. 23, 1629.

LETTER XXIII.

TO JAMES USSHER, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.

[Parr's Life, Letter clxvi. pp. 448, 449.]

Salutem in Christo.

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I hope your Grace will pardon me, that in all this time I have not written unto you. For though, I thank God, I have recovered my health, in a measure, beyond expectation, yet I have been so overlaid with business, that I have not been able to give you any account, or, at least, not such as I desired.

Your Lordship's first letters (for I owe you an answer to two) bear date April the 5th, and your later, June the 4th, 1630. The main of both letters is concerning Sir John Bathe. And though, in your last letters, you be confident that Sir John's grant is not passed the Seals, as he hath avouched it is, yet I must acquaint your Grace that you are mistaken therein; for it appeared, at the last sitting of the Committee, that the Seal was put to his grant at the beginning of April last[h]. Of

[h] [This was a grant of some Impropriations belonging to the Crown. See Elrington's Life of Ussher, pp. 111, 112.]

which doctrine you may make this use: what close conveyance and carriage there may be, when the Church is to be spoiled. I understand, by Mr. Hamilton, that the Lord Chancellor of Ireland is in Holy Orders; and that being Deacon, he holds an Archdeaconry yet of good value[i]. Surely, my Lord, if this be so, there is somewhat in it that I will not express by letter; but were I his superior in ordinary, I know what I would do, and that I have plainly expressed, both to his Majesty and the Lords Committees.

But, my Lord, for the business, I have stuck so close unto it, both with his Majesty and with the Lords, especially the Lord Treasurer[j], who hath been, and is very noble to the Church, that I hope Sir John Bathe will see his error, and pitch upon some other reward for his services, and surrender this patent, though sealed, that we may go on with the King's royal and pious grant to the Church.

Things being thus far onward once more, there are two things which stick with the Lords[k].

1. One is, they like not the placing of these impropriations upon any incorporations, Dublin, or other. To this I answered, that neither did I like it, and that it must be altered, because it is against law. So it is resolved that we shall hereafter take, not only that, but all other material passages of the grant into consideration; and, therefore, I think, neither your old, nor your new letter will stand. Some thought it fittest, that these impropriations should be left for the King to give. To this I replied, that this course would, by the suit of the clergy, and their journeys over, take off a great part of the benefit intended them. And to leave them in the power of the Lord Deputy, that might be but to enrich his secretaries, and expose the Church to that which I will not speak.

2. The other difficulty is, that this grant to the Church is too much against the King's profit in these difficult times, because in the lay-way the King's rent may be improved; which according to this grant cannot be. This blow I looked

[i] [Adam Visc. Loftus. He was appointed Archdeacon of Glendalough by his uncle, then Archbishop of Dublin. Elrington (Life of Ussher, p. 114,) states that he was only a layman.]

[j] [Richard, Lord Weston, afterwards Earl of Portland.]

[k] [A grant of Impropriations had been made in the previous year. See Collier, Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 749.]

not for; but answered upon the sudden, that I thought the Church of Ireland would be glad to take the King's grant, though it were with some improvement upon such impropriations as might well bear it. This I did, partly to bear off the shock for the time, and partly to gain opportunity to write to you, who understand that business better. And I pray you, by your next letters, give me all the help you can towards this business.

One thing more, and then I have done with Sir John Bathe. Upon occasion of his speech, That the Clergy had a third part of that kingdom, I represented to the Lords the paper which you sent me concerning the state of the county of Louth. It was a miserable spectacle to them all; yet, at the last, some doubt arose, whether those values there expressed, were the rate in the King's books, or the uttermost value to the incumbent. To this I was not able to make a resolute answer, yet I feared they were rates to the utmost value. Hereupon, the Lords required of me to write unto you, to desire you to send me word, with all the speed you can, what value that rate of yours contained; of which I pray fail not.

Your Grace is pleased, in another passage, to desire me not to be too strict to my rule, in choosing Deans only to be Bishops. My Lord, it is true, Deans are, or should be, the likeliest men to be fitted for bishoprics; but they, and no other, was never any rule of mine to my remembrance. My rule was, and is, and to that I shall ever be strict, not to suffer any Bishop to hold any deanery *in commendam*, if it lie in my power to hinder it.

For that which concerns the Bishop of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh[1], I have read the enclosed papers you sent, and see cause more than enough to pity; but the way for remedy will be full of difficulty. And for Kilfanora, there will be time enough to think upon annexation. For the College and their chauntry lands, &c., when they come for their patent, they shall not need to doubt all the lawful assistance that I can give them.

And now, my Lord, (for as my business stands, 'tis time to make an end,) I must needs thank you that you make it a

[1] [Robert Dawson.]

matter of joy to hear of my late honour in being chosen Chancellor of Oxford. My Lord, I speak really, it was beyond my deserts, and contrary to my desires; but, since it hath pleased God, by their love, to lay it upon me, I must undergo the burden as I may. My honourable predecessor enriched his name by the Greek manuscripts he gave [m]; and it gives me much content that I was the means of it. And now for the bargain which you mention of ancient coins, to the number of 5,500; I cannot upon the sudden say anything; for my own purse is too shallow, and my Lords, the Duke of Buckingham, and the Earl of Pembroke, are dead. You say they are a great bargain at 600*l.*; I pray therefore, if you have so much interest in the seller, send me word, as soon as you can, how many ounces the gold coin comes unto, and how many the silver, and then I shall be able to judge of the copper; and then, upon my return to those your letters, I will give you answer, whether I can find any noble spirit that will deal for them or no [n].

You may judge by these letters, I am not in haste. But indeed I am; and yet in the fulness of my business, more troubled a great deal, that I cannot remedy what I see amiss, than at any disproportion between the weakness of my shoulder and the weight of my load. Let me have your prayers, and in them, and God's grace, I shall rest

Your Grace's very loving Friend
and Brother,
GUIL. LONDON.

Fulham House, July 5, 1630.

LETTER XXIV.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Claror. Viror. ad Vossium Epistt., Epist. cxv. pp. 74, 75 [o].]

Salutem in Christo.

Literæ tuæ tres numero, Vir Clarissime, manus meas utrasque implevere, a quo te vel coram, vel per literas salutavi.

[m] [The Baroccian MSS.]

[n] [Laud presented a large number of coins to the University, probably obtained from this source. See Hist. of Chancellorship, Works, vol. v. pp. 136, 225.]

[o] [Exstat etiam, magna vero sui parte mutila, apud Præst. ac Erudit. Viror. Epistt., Epist. cccclxxiii. p. 742.]

Et pudet, et doleo. Amor tamen tuus, quo me frui gestio, facile huic tarditati veniam dabit, præsertim quum res meæ tibi innotuerint. Literæ enim tuæ novissimæ datæ sunt 14 Feb. 1630, quo tempore ego minus firma valętudine responsum nec illis, nec prioribus potui aptare. Nam post discessum tuum, Festo Nativitatis Domini nostri instante, etsi relapsus in febrem non contigit, nescio quomodo tamen turbata natura me iterum periclitantem vidit[p]. Et quid per hæc potuit (cum Hilario loquor) limosi corporis gravis anima?

Festo Paschatis sequente (quod, ut nosti, incidebat hoc anno in 28 Martii) confirmatior accedentem et ascendentem solem aspexi, et me paulatim negotiis et Aulæ et Ecclesiæ immiscui. Fretus tamen multo magis Deo et tempore anni, quam propriis viribus. Exinde festo finito, Deo sic disponente, negotia undique me obruebant. Certe primo non sine metu mei, et meorum, sed postea sub mole illa, qua vix major mihi unquam incubuit[q], crevere vires, et, misericordiam ampliante Deo, pristinam adeptus sum valetudinem. Semper tamen excipio tendonem fractum.

Hodie primum exui paululum negotia. Et hoc justitio dum fruor, te imprimis salutare cura fuit. Salvus itaque sis, mihi charissime, et a lævo recipias, quicquid adhuc amplius te, et studia, et familiam tuam, beare possit.

Ad literas quod attinet. Primæ discessum tuum tantum repetunt, et quam charus fuisti confratribus tuis Cantuariensibus. Gratias ego egi nonnullis eorum, quos vidisse contigit, et nomine tuo. Sic illic omnia certa, et, spero, tibi grata sunt. Filius tuus Johannes dum redit Londinum, non multos post dies me invisebat. Claudicabat, sed paululum, et tum quoque magna spes claudicationem illam non fore diuturnam. Ab illo tempore eum non vidi, studiis spero intentum. At ubi loci nunc sit, non dubito quin ipse te certiorem fecerit, et quam graviter Cantabrigia peste laborat[r]. Morbus ille a vobis, militibus quibusdam redeuntibus, transmissus.

Literæ tuæ quæ his succedebant, felices nunciæ fuerunt salvi et sospitis reditus tui in patriam[s]. Gaudio id certe magno mihi cessit, utpote cui sanitas tua, et vita in longum

[p] [Vide Diarium, ad Aug. 14, Sept. 7, Oct. 20, 26, Mar. 21, 1629.]

[q] [Quum admissus fuerit in Cancellariatum Univ. Oxon.]

[r] [Vide Diarium ad Aug. 24, 1630.]

[s] [Vide G. J. Vossii Epist. cxx. pp. 157, 158.]

protracta in usum Ecclesiæ, in primis votis sit. Facile credo fuisse non paucos, qui tibi reditum gratularentur, quam dispari animo ipsi viderint. Sat scio quales inter vos amicos habeant, qui Potestatis Regiæ, et veteris Ecclesiæ cultores quoquomodo existunt. Si cordatioribus exemisti scrupulum, illud perbene; qui tribunum olent, ad populum refero; curet scilicet, qui vult. Me non nominant literæ illæ, sed satis intelligo, et multum rideo insaniam.

Promittis hic Institutiones Oratorias. Et eas jam accepi per manus doctissimi tui Junii[t]. Ille mihi ante charus, charior nunc nomine tuo. Pollicitus est ille se una cum gratiis ob libros illos doctissimos et tuos, me excusatum habiturum apud te, quod tum literas non dedissem. Nunc ego iterum Baronium inculco. Nosti quid velim. Et est quod vel maxime usui sit Ecclesiæ. Induciæ vestræ cum Hispano precor aut non sint, aut sint cum bono et vestro et Ecclesiæ. Nec imprudenter cavent meo judicio, qui exinde domestica dissidia magis timent; præcipue prout Religio hodie apud vos. De Scioppio vestro[u], et reliquis Reformatæ Religionis propudiis, quid dicam nescio, gaudeo tamen Amstelodamenses, ubi libertatis nescio quid asylum, in maledicum tam severos exstitisse.

Novissimæ literæ tuæ nil aliud fere spirant, quam honorem Higgii nostri[v]. Certe multum tibi debet Oxoniensis Academia nomine ejus, nec minimum ego, qui Higgium illum virum moderatum æque ac doctum semper quibus potui modis promovebam. Non opus est ut scribam; ille, scio, narrabit quanto amore, maximo illo certe, si prudenti, si fausto bene est, me Oxonienses, nunc alio nomine mei, prosecuti sunt, et me Cancellarium, indignum simul et nolentem elegerunt. Inter eligentes Higgius. Eum sine literis remittere ad vos me graviter pupugit, sed tum vix respirare datum. Gratias tamen ago, et tibi, et filio Francisco, ob honoratum Higgium.

Quod reliquum est scias velim, etsi tempestates, quæ

[t] [Franciscus Junius, cujus sororem Vossius in matrimonium duxerat. De eo plura videas apud Wood, Ath. Ox. iii. 1139.]

[u] [Gaspar Scioppius, in castra Romanensium transfuga, erga Reformatos maledicentissimus.]

[v] [Griffinus Higgs, e Coll. Merton., Elizabethæ Reginæ Boiém. a sacellis gradu Doctoris in S. Theol. in Acad. Leidensi nuperrime est insignitus: Decanatum Lichfieldensem postea adeptus est. (Wood, Ath. Ox. iii. 481.)]

sæculo hoc exagitant Ecclesiam, sedando non sim, nolle tamen me, Deo favente, aut causæ aut officio deesse. Interim cuivis fere obvium est, quam periculose jactantur Respublicæ, fluctuante Ecclesia. Ad filium tuum Johannem quod spectat, quum proxime videro (brevi id spero futurum, Deus si pro misericordia sanarit Cantabrigiam) effectum dabo quod postulas. Tu modo ut mei quotidianis in precibus memor sis obnixe rogo, ut in nomine Christi; ne, dum moliuntur inimici, solus sim. Vivas interim opto, valeasque, ego ut sim

Virtutum tuarum cultor, sicut

Sum et tui amantissimus,

GUIL. LONDIN.

Julii 21, 1630.

LETTER XXV.

TO DR. ROBERT PINKE, WARDEN OF NEW COLLEGE.

[Lambeth MSS. Numb. dccccxliii. p. 141.]

Salutem in Christo.

WORTHY SIR,—I heard, when I was at Court at Windsor, that my worthy friend, Mr. Warden of Winchester [w], was ill, and in some danger, which I was, and am, very sorry for. Since my return to Fulham, I hear the same confirmed, and it seems his danger increases. Though I know not the particulars of your local Statutes, yet I know the preferment must fall upon a New College man, and that the election is with you.

I know you understand that the schoolmaster of Winchester, Mr. Stanley [x], is my Chaplain, and he was (being otherwise a stranger) commended unto me by very near friends of mine. A good able scholar he is, and gave his Majesty good contentment lately when he preached before him. Now I am informed, that for three elections successively the schoolmasters of Winchester have been chosen Wardens, and I should be very glad if he might be the

[w] [Dr. Nicholas Love.]

[x] [Edward Stanley, afterwards Prebendary of Winchester. He preached the first sermon in that cathedral after the Restoration. (Wood, Ath. Ox. iii. 590.)]

fourth, if this place fall void, which is at this time my suit unto you. I am induced the rather, because I can assume for Mr. Stanley, if he be chosen, that he shall be a very respective and true brother Warden to you; and besides, as I conceive, the choice of him will be more advantage to your College than the choice of any other, because by his choice the schoolmaster's place will be a present and a rich preferment for another Fellow, which I doubt not but you will so order that a friend of your own may have.

I hope you will not think it amiss that I write thus unto you, because it is for a Chaplain of mine own, and a Chaplain that so stands out of my way, that, where he lives, I have not anything to bestow upon him; and I know not any circumstance which should make him unfit for this your favour. I told you I was ignorant of the particulars of your Statutes, and so I am, and, therefore, if this suit of mine be cross to them in any considerable thing, I shall fairly submit it to your wisdom. For I shall ever consider that God hath disposed of me to the place I bear, to keep and preserve the liberties of statutes and elections according to oath, and not to put any stress upon them, but rather to stand as a bar and a hindrance to any power, when it is attempted by others.

I hope, my Lord, your Visitor[y] will not write to prejudice this request of mine, but being absent, if he be over entreated, I shall in this take it upon me to give him satisfaction. Thus wishing you all health and happiness, and desirous to be beholding to you in this, I leave you to the grace of God, and rest

Your very loving Friend,

GUIL. LONDON.

Fulham House,
Septemb. 10th, 1630.

To the right worshipfull my very worthy friend Dr. Pinke, Warden of New College, Oxon. these.

Endorsed: Septemb. 10, 1630. My first letters to the Warden of New College about Mr. Stanley.

---

[y] [The Bishop of Winchester. Richard Neile was now Bishop.]

LETTER XXVI.

FROM WILLIAM BEDELL, BISHOP OF KILMORE, ETC.

[Tanner MSS. vol. cclxxviii. p. 99.]

RIGHT REV. FATHER, MY HONOURABLE GOOD LORD,—With my humble service remembered. Since my last to your Lordship of the 1st of April, I have set on foot my suit at the Council-board, for the rights of my bishoprics, founding it on that beneficial clause of his Majesty's gracious letters, wherein he was pleased to give order, that if I found myself wronged by any unlawful act of my predecessors, either in the profits or jurisdictions of my bishoprics, I might be relieved there. I propounded first my jurisdiction, impaired by my predecessor's appointing me a Chancellor; wherein, before I relate my success, I shall declare to your Lordship the grounds and manner of my proceeding, whereby I shall with one labour endeavour to satisfy some part of your expectation from me, viz. certify you of such occurrents as concern the Church of Ireland, and free myself from the false imputations of slanderous tongues, which there, perhaps, as well as here, have, or shall misreport my proceedings.

My Lord, I do thus account, that amongst all the impediments to the work of God amongst us, there is not any greater than the abuse of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This is the opinion of the most godly, judicious, and learned men that I have known. And the demonstration thereof is plain. The people pierce not into the inward and true reasons of things; they are sensible in the purse. And that religion that makes men that profess it, and shows them to be despisers of the world, and so far from encroaching upon others in matter of base gain as rather to part with their own, they magnify. This bred the admiration of the primitive Christians; contrary causes must needs bring forth contrary effects. Wherefore, let us preach never so painfully, and live never so piously ourselves, so long as the officers in our courts do prey upon the people, they account us no better than publicans. And so much the more deservedly, because we are called spiritual men and reformed Christians. In this kind there hath been (they say) wonderful abuse in

this kingdom. While I was in Dublin, before my consecration, I understood by many principal men, both of my diocese and others, that of all those that have exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction in this land these late years, the most noted man and most cried out upon, was one Mr. Alan Cook, Chancellor to my predecessor; insomuch as he had been questioned in the Star-Chamber, and rather by error in proceeding for the manner, or some other cause than want of matter, escaped the trial. Among the Irish he hath gotten the nickname of Pouke; and, indeed, they fear him like the fiend of hell. To his austerity the abandoning of the country by above a thousand of the inhabitants the last year was more imputed than to the hardness of the times. And a principal man of his Majesty's Council said it within these two months to me, that he had been more burdensome to that part of the country than the contribution to the soldiers. This man, as was told me by others, had a commission to be my Chancellor. Himself would not so much as show it me, or desire that, with my good leave, he might hold it; which, although it seemed to me somewhat uncivil, yet I was not willing to break with him, or infringe the acts of my predecessor, till, by the daily complaint of my neighbours, and some of my tenants, and of the clergy, I was enforced to demand the sight of his patent. I found a vast heap of authority conferred upon him without due form, Latin, or common sense. One period before the *Habendum* consisting of above 540 words, and yet without any one importing a grant, or any other principal verb at all. Nothing left to the Bishop but a mere shadow of authority. I called the Chapter, examined whether they confirmed it or no, which they denied not, accounting it more concerned the Bishop than them; acknowledging, that the Bishop's great seal was not put to it. Whereupon, I, accounting it void or surreptitious, or revoking it in case it had any validity, did inhibit Mr. Cook to do anything by virtue of it as my Vicar, and the clergy to assist him therein. Upon this he appealed to my Lord Primate's Court, from whence I was inhibited, and cited to appear to answer him; he being in the citation styled Vicar of the Courts of Kilmore and Ardagh, lawfully established. For this so apparent a forejudging the cause

ere it was heard, I entered a recusation before a public notary, which I sent to my Lord Primate; yet submitting the cause to his own censure, *omni appellatione remotâ*, if my adversary were so pleased. This he refused. Thus did it hang till Hilary Term. In the mean season I went about my diocese myself, and sat in mine own courts, redressing the disorders, and mitigating the fees, (whereof yet I took no penny, but sequestered them only,) and in a short space have, as I hope, disposed the people to some better opinion of our religion and jurisdiction, than before they had conceived.

The case at Dublin was divided in pleading by my counsel: 1st, That no Bishop may grant a commission longer than during his own time. 2nd, That my predecessor, holding two bishoprics united only for term of life, could make no greater estate than his own. That by his death the bishoprics were again divided, and anew united by his Majesty, so as in them I am not his successor. The other part would make a Vicar-general a standing office, and said, the Dean and Chapter might anciently choose a Bishop, much more then confirm a Bishop's Vicar for life. Especially they urged precedents in England, and some here. The Lord Chancellor seemed unwilling to have this case determined here, which he said was never yet adjudged in England. Those of the Council that are of the profession of the law, required it might be argued again at the beginning of Michaelmas Term, which was granted.

Since that, Mr. Cook hath procured me to be cited again to the Lord Primate's Court, where I appeared July 29, alleging that the cause is depending before the Lords Justices and Council, and refusing again the Chancellor, Mr. George Singe[z], to be either judge, or assistant therein, as having been Mr. Cook's master and patron, and now his familiar friend, and having discovered some spleen against me in certain letters which since this cause came into that Court he had sent me.

Your Lordship hath here the historical part of this business; whereto if I shall be bold to add the prognostical, it is

[z] [He was appointed Vicar-General and Dean of Dromore by Archbishop Hampton, and was consecrated Bishop of Cloyne, Nov. 11, 1638. (Wood, Ath. Ox. iii. 347.)]

this. That, although I have his Majesty's patents as large for me as I can desire, the canon law as clear as the sun (whose maxims are these, *Vicarius perdit jurisdictionem morte Episcopi; Vicarius removeri potest ad libitum Episcopi, etiamsi sit constitutus cum juramento de non revocando; Vicarius mortuo Episcopo non potest perficere causas inchoatas vivo Episcopo:* and *de facto,* Mr. Cook, after the death of my predecessor, took a new commission from the Lord Primate to execute the jurisdiction *sede vacante*); lastly, though I have the common law equal, if this be but a commission; and as the Lord Chief Baron said openly, by the law one judge cannot appoint another in his stead; yet, because in lands and possessions the grant of the Bishop, with consent of Dean and Chapter, is good, it will be carried so here also. I consider my adversary's cunning, potency, friends in all courts, purse: the King's Serjeant and Attorney are for him against his Majesty's patent. The Lord Chancellor had sometimes a like commission bestowed upon him by his uncle, as I have been told by some of the Council. He persuades me to compound with Mr. Cook, which, for the incredible scandal that would follow, I can never do. He (as Mr. Cook, in a manner boasting, told me) hath nominated him since the term to be judge in a cause of the Admiralty touching a prize here taken. Add to all these, the confidence of the man, that comes and sets himself by me, and quarrels with me in mine own court, and will sit there, and ask me no leave. In these respects I give it gone; unless it would please his Majesty to interpret his own meaning in his gracious letters for me, and the patents thereupon founded; or to signify his express pleasure, that this cause may be maturely discussed according to his laws, notwithstanding any examples there or here inuring; or, lastly, to give order to his learned counsel to see to the interest of his crown, in upholding his grants and patents, and by what warrant they are infringed by the pretended patents of others.

My Lord, if this were mine own particular case alone, I should not be so bold as to request your favour and assistance hereunto. But it is the common interest of Bishops, who through their own sufferance do now but serve for cyphers to make up the wrongs and extortions of their

[illegible]

LETTER [illegible]

[illegible] ARMAGH.

[illegible]

[illegible] Grace's second [illegible] a man known [illegible] I have, upon receipt [illegible] presented Dr. Barlow's suit [illegible] to his Majesty of [illegible] the Archbishop of [illegible] I hold it very unfit, and [illegible] in the Church, to have [illegible] a deanery in [illegible] I am informed) much [illegible] and because I have [illegible] for so he hath as- [illegible] must be done at [illegible] him, as well for [illegible] new thing in that [illegible] I made bold to [illegible] graciously pleased [illegible] his Majesty's special [illegible] to send letters [illegible]

[illegible] commanded me to write [illegible] young men be not com- [illegible] that he shall hardly [illegible] *in commendam*. Any other [illegible] he shall be content to [illegible] to serve your Grace's [illegible] Dr. Barlow. I wish him [illegible] to excuse my not writing [illegible] and Term. I have not lei- [illegible] and shall ever rest [illegible] Friend and Brother,

[illegible] LONDON.

[illegible] Dr. Barlow's tutor that [illegible] a deanery *in commendam*.

[illegible] of Tuam.]

[illegible] formerly Fel- [illegible]

, and scandal to our
officers take in our
people there. And
you, than with us,
what more broken
a great deal of
of the Church with
you, and not without
, we live in times
only with weeds
it, which, though
they are grown up
in it.
and nearer your
you I see little
as you propose.
(in that Church
cellors or Vicars-
by patent during
, and as their
serve. And this
Lordship, so soon as
into the ancient
those which you
desire your Lord-

these kingdoms,
continuance will be
They answered you
been decided in
that they should
the cathedrals of
shall come on
that all the civil
which are many
they will plead
burden of a diocese
ry, they should
I think now for
Christendom hath

officers. They begin to scorn to be our vicegerents. Two citations I have received from my Lord Primate's Court, in the former whereof my pretended Chancellor is called *Vicarius Cur. Kilmor. et Ardagh.*; in the other, *Diœceseos*. If they were (as anciently) constituted only *durante beneplacito*, they would know themselves. For my part, God is my witness, that if I thought I could be excused in conscience for the misgovernment of the people whom God and his Majesty have committed unto me, I could easily suffer Mr. Cook to exercise the jurisdiction, though there be left me nothing but the name of it; but when the blame also and the shame of religion lies upon it, I hope good men will not account me pragmatical if I be sensible, and desire to fulfil my profession made at my consecration, that I would be gentle and merciful for Christ's sake to poor and needy people, and such as be destitute of help. These poor people (to whom, to be put into the Bishop's book, as they call it, hath been worse than their imaginary purgatory) do beseech your Lordship, and by you, his Majesty, to pity them. Religion intreats you to remove this scandal; the Church, to reform this disorder. I have said and done what I can. I leave the success to God. To whose gracious protection I commit your Lordship, and shall ever remain

Your Lordship's most obliged,

WILL. KILMOREN. ET ARDAGHEN.

Kilmore, Aug. 7, 1630.

To the Right Rev. Father in God,
William, Lord Bishop of London,
my honourable good Lord, deliver
these.

LETTER XXVII.

TO WILLIAM BEDELL, BISHOP OF KILMORE, &c.

[Tanner MSS. vol. cclxxviii. p. 104.]

Salutem in Christo.

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I have read over your Lordship's large letters, both the historical and the prognostical part, and truly, my Lord, I must needs acknowledge, that there

arises a great deal of hurt to ourselves, and scandal to our calling, by the courses which our under officers take in our courts, and the harrowing of the poor people there. And I easily conceive, it must be worse with you, than with us, because the state of that Church is somewhat more broken of the two. Your Lordship hath expressed a great deal of care and a great deal of zeal to that part of the Church with which God and the King hath trusted you, and not without a great deal of judgment. But, my Lord, we live in times in which the Church is overgrown, not only with weeds within it, but with trees, and bushes about it, which, though they were set at first for a fence, yet now they are grown up they drop sourly upon whatsoever is good in it.

And now, my Lord, to descend lower and nearer your business, you must first give me leave to tell you I see little hope of any remedy in the thing and way as you propose. For, if I mistake not, the question is, whether (in that Church especially) it be fit that Bishops' Chancellors or Vicars-general should have or hold their offices by patent during life, or stand only at the Bishop's pleasure, and as their merit and justice in their courts shall deserve. And this being the question, I shall promise your Lordship, so soon as I come to London among my books, to look into the ancient canons and laws of the Church, both those which you mention and others; but in the meantime desire your Lordship to consider these particulars following:

First, The canon law hath been blasted in these kingdoms, so that any use taken up of almost any continuance will be able to bear head against it. Secondly, They answered you truly, that told you this case had never yet been decided in England; or if it were, the overruling was that they should hold for life, for so the practice goes in all the cathedrals of England. Thirdly. Wherever this question shall come on foot, whoever appears in it must look that all the civil lawyers, and all the friends they can make, which are many and great, will be sure to oppose it. And they will plead reason, that where so great a part of the burden of a diocese lies upon them, it will be fit, if not necessary, they should be invested for time of life. Fourthly, I think now for many years together the practice through Christendom hath

been (except in some few exempts) that the Chancellors have held by patents for life. Fifthly, I would be peremptory against that hold, and all grants of a Bishop longer than his own life, if I were sure all Bishops were and would be such as they should. For otherwise the pressure of the people would be as great by a bad Bishop as by a bad Chancellor, and the scandal greater; whereas now sometimes a good Chancellor moderates an ill Bishop, though at some other time a bad Chancellor troubles a good. Last of all, and which is most forcing amongst us, I doubt it will appear that patents for life have been so long granted in both kingdoms, that the common law will make them good, do you, or I, or any man else, what we can: for to imagine that all Bishops will agree to rectify such an abuse as is consequent upon these patents for life, is mere building in the air.

For the particular person with whom you have to do, Mr. Alan Cook, I never heard of him before, but it seems by your letters he knows very well how to lick his own fingers. As for Mr. Singe, I think my Lord Primate (if I forget not one of his letters) hath had as harsh music from him as another man hath had of his Chancellor, and therefore it is not very probable, that your Lordship should find any more favour in his court against Mr. Cook. And for the bringing of your cause to the Council-board, though I make no doubt but you shall find there all honourable justice with favour, yet I fear they will do nothing in a business of this weight, being altogether without example and precedent here.

And for the proposals towards the end of your letter, which are three, without all or some of which you seem to give your cause gone; to deal openly and freely with you, I do not see how they can relieve you. For first, for his Majesty's interpretation of his own meaning in his gracious letters for you, and the patents thereupon founded; you may be sure he will make no other interpretation than may stand with his laws, neither may I desire more. For the second, for his Majesty to signify his express pleasure that this cause may be maturely discussed according to his laws, notwithstanding any example in either kingdom, I doubt that the common law, which upon a prohibition will be

judge, will upon never so mature discussing make good their patents, unless you can infringe any by some particular exceptions. And, thirdly, though his Majesty should give order (as you desire) to his learned counsel never so strictly to look to the interests of his crown in upholding his grants and patents, &c., which were no hard matter to obtain, as I conceive, yet that would be to no purpose, if the law be for their patents, for then they will easily make that answer to his Majesty.

Now therefore upon the whole matter I have but these two things to say: The one is, I do not believe you will be able to do anything against Mr. Cook's patent, unless you can find, that it is drawn against law, (and if he refuse to show his patent, there is means enough, I think, in the ordinary way to force him to it,) or unless you can legally prove, that he hath carried himself so ill, as that he hath forfeited the patent, though rightly granted. The other is mentioned by yourself, and it is an offer made by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, if I understand you right, that you should compound with Mr. Cook; to which you say you may by no means yield, for the infinite scandal that would follow upon it. Indeed it is true, if you compound with him only to settle his patent and take money for that, and leave him to vex the people more till he hath made up his money, it must needs be a very unworthy act in you, and full of scandal. But if (where you cannot remedy it otherwise) you there compound, and in that composition bind up Mr. Cook, that the people may have justice and ease, I do not yet see what ill is in that, or what scandal can follow upon it; for I shall not advise the making of any other composition, than that which shall be free from corruption on your part, and for the just and orderly settling of your jurisdiction on his.

My Lord, my occasions are many and great, yet I have stolen time, such as I could, to give you answer. The case never fell either under my study or practical consideration, yet I have adventured to write freely unto you. You must pardon both the freedom and the weakness, the case especially being such as a man cannot tell of whom to ask counsel. For none can be asked but a Bishop or a civilian. And if a

Bishop be asked, he is likely to say for you; but if you ask a civilian, I am sure he will be for Mr. Cook. And where I now am, I can meet with no experienced man of either. In Court haste, therefore I leave you to the grace of God, and rest

Your Lordship's very loving Friend and Brother,
[GUIL. LONDON[a].]

Fulham House,
September 11, 1630.

LETTER XXVIII.

TO DR. ROBERT PINKE, WARDEN OF NEW COLLEGE.

[Lambeth MSS. Numb. dccccxliii. p. 143.]

Salutem in Christo.

SIR,—I hear how lovingly you received my former letters, and how careful you are for my sake of Mr. Stanley. No part of your love shall be lost, and if it shall please you to use me, you shall find it. I had rather act the rest as it comes in my way than speak it; and to that I refer myself.

I took sufficient order before I went from Windsor that no letters should come from his Majesty for any other, if Mr. Stanley had them not, and (as you may see by my former letters to yourself) I purposed there to leave it, ever resolving to keep me entire to the duty of my place, that elections might go as statutes directed, and as merits prevailed. But when I came to see (for I saw it), that his Majesty's letters were aimed at for another, and in some words that I had no great cause to like, I then thought fit my Chaplain might use his friends, yet I ordered it so that the letters which are come might no way trench upon the liberty of your election, but keep near the precedent which I saw written for Dr. Love[b].

I must end with the same thanks with which I began,

[a] [This cause was ultimately taken into the Court of Chancery, and the Chancellor confirmed Mr. Cook's appointment, with 100*l.* costs. See Elrington's Life of Ussher, pp. 116, 117, where some other particulars relating to the case are mentioned.]

[b] [See a copy of the King's letter to Warden and Fellows of New Coll. Oct. 14, 1613, in favour of Nicholas Love, Lamb. MSS. Numb. dccccxliii. pp. 149—151. Also from T. Winton. (Bilson) in favour of the same person, dated Oct. 25, 1613, ibid. pp. 151—153; and from Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, enjoining them to make a free election, dated Oct. 12, 1613, ibid. pp. 153—155.]

which, if God spare me life, you shall find to be very well. So in court haste I leave you to the grace of God, and shall ever rest

Your very loving Friend,

GUIL. LONDON.

Theobalds, Septemb. 12, 1630.
To the right worshipful my very worthy friend Dr. Pinke, Warden of St. Mary New College in Oxford, These.
Endorsed: September 12, 1630.
My second letters to the Warden of of New Coll. about Mr. Stanley.

LETTER XXIX.

TO DR. ROBERT PINKE, WARDEN OF NEW COLLEGE.

[Lambeth. MSS. Numb. dccccxliii. p. 145.]

Salutem in Christo.

SIR,—I am very much beholding to you for your love, which I shall esteem no whit the less because it succeeded not[c]. I am rather the more in your debt because you laboured it so freely and so constantly to the last. And I pray be persuaded, that when God shall give me an opportunity to return it, you shall find me ready to do all parts of a friend.

I hear of some things in this business, which I have not deserved, and therefore looked not for. But I hope you shall suffer no more than you have already. And I know you will carry yourself so justly and so worthily in your government, that you will not need to fear any faction at home, which I hear bear bolder for any power abroad. And in your wisdom you will be the more wary, because you see what watch is upon you.

Give me thus far leave (out of a great deal of love) to be bold with you also in another particular, which I observed when I lived in Oxford, and which I hear you yet continue. It is that you live a little too much reserved to yourself;

[c] [John Harris was elected Warden. He sided with the Presbyterians, and was one of the Assembly of Divines. (Wood, Ath. Ox. iii. 455.)]

which as it cannot but damp your spirits, and take off from your experience, so doubtless it adds to the insolency of the Fellows which oppose you, to see you acquaint yourself with no other Heads, nor no other resort to you. I know divers would be glad you would think of this; and I do verily persuade myself the party in your House would not be as they are, if they saw you backed with other men of note in the town. If this be against your nature, or your resolution justly grounded, I leave it to your wisdom, and only desire my love and my liberty may not be mistaken.

I sent you a few lines the last week, but they were so enclosed that I doubt they came not to you, and 'tis no matter for anything in them. For Mr. Stanley had forgotten to write me the certain day of the election, so I shot at Rovers for that particular.

I hear some of your house have been very bold with me, and charged upon me the procuring of letters for one Morlye, that he might be Fellow (which they say he deserved not), and have greater allowance of money for his travel than your Statutes allow; or at least that I connived at it, and let them pass. I shall not much labour to give them satisfaction; but I assure you, *in fide boni viri*, I am most innocent of this charge. And had you sent unto me about it, I would have kneeled to the King for preservation of your Statutes. And how tender I was of them in this last particular you best know, who alone had letters from me. And while I speak of them, I pray do me the favour to send me the copy of my letters back again, that I may have them to show, or the letters themselves, which you please, if, at least, you did keep them. Again I thank you, and am heartily sorry you should suffer for my sake, or mine. So I leave you to the grace of God, and shall ever rest

Your very loving Friend,

GUIL. LONDON.

Fulham, Octob. 1, 1630.

To the right worshipful my very worthy friend Dr. Pinke, Warden of New College in Oxon, These.

Endorsed: Octob. 1, 1630.

My last letters to Mr. Warden of New Coll. about Mr. Stanley.

LETTER XXX.

TO DR. CHRISTOPHER POTTER, PROVOST OF QUEEN'S.

[In the possession of Queen's Coll. Oxford.]

Salutem in Christo.

SIR,—I received a letter from you the last week, and had I not come home as I did, lame and sick, I had given you present answer. I am sorry to hear that Dr. Rawlinson is so ill, as it seems by you he is. I heard a flying report of it about a fortnight since, because much about the same time there was one of the same name in Bedfordshire very sick, and, as I hear, since that time dead. This made me hope there was no danger toward the Dr. you mean, but that there had been a mistake only; now your letters make me fear again 'tis otherwise; I pray God comfort him according to his extremities whate'er they be.

Concerning your business about St. Edmund's Hall, I must needs say you have made a fair representation to me, and I shall take it into as just a consideration. You know I am but newly come to be Chancellor, and have had as yet but little time to think of those things which may most concern it. As for those which belong to myself, I have put them last, and least thought on them, therefore I must desire you to lend me a little time to consider. For as I shall be ever unwilling to trespass against any privileges or statutes, either of the whole body of the University or of any college in particular, so shall I be ever loth to sink or weaken any rights belonging to the place I bear, lest afterwards my successors should have cause to say I had been unworthy to the office. So soon as I have fully informed myself, and weighed my business, you shall receive such farther answer as is fit, and I hope to satisfaction. In the meantime I am glad of occasion to hear of you and your health, of which God make you long master; to whose grace I leave you, and shall ever rest

Your very loving Friend,

GUIL. LONDON.

Fulham House, Octob. 15, 1630.

LETTER XXXI.

TO DR. BROOKE, MASTER OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE[d].

[Ward's Lives of Gresham Professors[e].]

For your pastoral I take little care, but wish it well; but for your other tract I must needs say thus much,—fifteen years study cannot but beat out something. And I like it well that you mean to have the judgment of so many and such men upon it. And if God give me leisure, and the tract be not too long, I shall be glad to read it too. And the making even of the old way will to most men seem better than a new. Nevertheless I am yet where I was, that something about these controversies is unmasterable in this life. Neither can I think any expression can be so happy as to settle all these difficulties. And however I do much doubt, whether the King will take any man's judgment so far as to have these controversies any further stirred, which now, God be thanked, begin to be at more peace, etc. And for the several copies which you mention, to send to those friends you name, it shall be wisdom for you to take heed that none be stole out privately to the press, before you are aware.

LETTER XXXII.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Claror. Viror. ad Vossium Epistt., Epist. cvi. p. 68[f].]

Salutem in Christo.

VIR SPECTATISSIME,—Quum literas meas novissimas darem (et parcius hoc facere cogor pro negotiis quæ urgent et premunt fatiscentem) literæ tuæ ad me pervenerunt. Sic situlæ

[d] [Samuel Brooke was, on May 13, 1631, admitted Archdeacon of Coventry, and died the middle of September following. Prynne (Cant. Doom, p. 167) says that he wrote an Arminian treatise of Predestination, and gives in the same place his reply to this letter of the Archbishop. This treatise does not appear to have been printed. (Wood, F. O. i. 401, 402.)]

[e] [This portion of a letter is printed from a MS. in Trinity College, Cambridge, endorsed, 'December 9, 1630. The passage of my letter to Dr. Brooke, concerning a Tract of his.']

[f] [Exstat etiam, magna vero sui parte mutila, apud Præst. ac Erud. Viror. Epistt., Epist. cccexciii. p. 758.]

nostræ mutuo fontem petiere, dum neuter, quid alter ageret, certior factus.

Literæ illæ jam antiquæ et adhuc præ manibus, sed sine responsione, et quod sæpius impedivit volentem, idem est. Nonas illæ Sextiles præ se ferunt[g], et hæ xii. Cal. Feb., nec tamen adhuc responsio parata. Credideris forsan me gelu quodam, etiam hac nimis temperata hyeme, obriguisse; hoc te metu ut liberem, ecce jam tandem te iterum saluto, tibi omnia exopto bona. Cum anno novo incipiat, recurratque in sinum felicitas.

Prima literarum tuarum facies gratulatur mihi Cancellariatum Oxonii mei, et subridet. Gaudio sit illud tibi, Academiæ salus; mihi sat scio onus incumbit, et cui nunquam par ero. Quin et his exulceratis Ecclesiæ temporibus, nec Ecclesiæ tantum (nam et sic solet punire Deus) nescio, ita me Deus amet, nescio quid agendum sit, mihi præsertim. Sed aliquid est, quod urget, et ducentem sequor.

Illustrissimus Princeps noster, pro tenella illa ætate (Deo gratias) abunde valet[h]. Et mihi quidem gratissimum est, quod lætitiæ illius, quam nos ex felicissima ipsius Nativitate merito percipimus, te quoque consortem præbeas. Vivat ille valeatque diu, serius tamen spero paternis succedet sceptris.

Alia sunt quæ properans cogor omittere. Sed mortem Matthiæ Martinii[i] certe eo impensius doleo, quo magis indiget Ecclesia æquitate illa, quæ in illo viguit, et quæ spero tamen non est penitus cum illo sepulta. Penitus, dico. Vereor tamen ne multo rarior sit, quam quæ deceret togam nostram. Historia illa, unde profitebatur se eam hausisse, prolixe habet in se unde eam conferre possit, nisi lectores habeat admodum iniquos[j]. Iterum tibi eo nomine gratias ago. Nunc accinge (promisisti enim et non semel) ad historiam aliam, veteris nempe Ecclesiæ, scribendam. Magnopere cupio (Deo si placuerit) antequam fata mihi aperient sepulchrum, Baronium videre sub telis tuis cadentem. Nec literas potes a me ullas exspectare sine stimulo.

[g] [Vide G. J. Vossii Epist. cxv. p. 153.]

[h] [Carolus, Princeps Walliæ, natus Maii 29, 1630.]

[i] [Auctor Lexici Philologici. In SynodoDordrechtana magnam partem egit, et moderata consilia prosequutus est.]

[j] [Historia Pelagiana ab ipso Vossio conscripta.]

Et ecce quum manum chartulæ huic eram appositurus, aliæ literæ tuæ ad me perveniunt[k]. Illustrissimus Legatus rediens, non redux sine te. De te certe nec pauca nec parva loquitur. Quin et gratias egi, quod nomine meo te sibi cognitum charumque habuit.

Ad negotium quod attinet. Academiæ vestræ ita collapsam esse disciplinam non sine dolore audio. Sunt hæc certe semina omnium malorum, tum in Ecclesia, tum in civili statu, quod loca educationi juvenum, in Artibus simul et Religione, olim dicata, ita laxata sint in omne quod vel maxime dedecet juventutem Christianam. Ad cædes vero, easque frequenter deventum esse, quis ferat?

Consilium quod petis libentissime darem, si, quod optas, præsens essem. Res certe magna et gravis; tibi honorifica et utilis futura; Amstelodamensibus forsitan non desiderata magis, quam salutaris. Rationes, quas proponis, primo intuitu firmæ videntur, et rotundæ, sine offensione, quam novi, ulla. Hoc unicum serio considerandum, quid Ordines vestri de consilio hoc tuo senserint, et quibus fundamentis nixi. Nam si illis transitio hæc tua parum Reipublicæ vestræ utilis censebitur, quis scit, quid inde dispendii, quid periculi tibi possit accedere? Quod ex animo deprecor. Scio te cautum fore et prudentem; et spero Deum, cui servis, electionem tuam ita velle disponere in melius, ut illud in te assumas, quod simul et licitum, et utile, et honorificum sit. Quod semper erit in votis

Amici tui, et rerum
tuarum studiosissimi,
GUIL. LOND.

12 Cal. Feb. 1630.

LETTER XXXIII.

TO DR. CHRISTOPHER POTTER, PROVOST OF QUEEN'S.

[In the possession of Queen's Coll. Oxford.]

Salutem in Christo.

SIR,—I received letters from you the last week concerning Dr. Rawlinson's death, or his being *in extremis;* upon which

[k] [Vide G. J. Vossii Epist. cxxxv. pp. 168, 169.]

you inferred the near, if not present, vacancy of Edmund Hall. I could not give you answer to those letters by reason of the urgent business which lay upon me; yet I desired you should not only know that I had received them, but also how respective I stood to your claim when it should be made; of both which I sent you word, though briefly, in Dr. Juxon's letters. You know how tender I was to meddle with your evidences, or anything concerning that place, till I had apparent certainty of Dr. Rawlinson's death[l]; and my reasons, I think, were just. Upon this I thought I should have had so much respect from you and the College, as might have borne a fair return of my letters unto you, before you had proceeded unto any election, especially considering that Dr. Rawlinson was not dead when you wrote those letters to me. For since that I have received direct information out of Shropshire, by a neighbour minister that came to me, that Dr. Rawlinson died upon Thursday was seven-night, about four in the afternoon; and your letters came to me that very night, and you proceeded to an election before I could send any answer upon Saturday; which was more haste than was fit, unless I had been formerly acquainted with your title, and resolved upon your right. I think I have not so carried businesses in the University, as that you should suspect my justice; and, therefore, being the first in this kind that fell since I was Chancellor, a little respect might have been had to me, and not such a sudden resolution taken as must needs seem to slight me, and can do you no good. For in whomsoever the choice be, the approbation is necessarily mine; and since you have been so quick in the choice, you shall find me as slow, perhaps, in the admittance. And were it not that I so far tender the memory of Dr. Ayry[m], I would resolutely say, this man whom you have chosen should never be Principal; and what it may prove yet, I cannot tell. When I have had more leisure to consider of

[l] [Dr. John Rawlinson, who was originally a Fellow of S. John's, was Laud's chief opponent in his election as President. (Heylin, Cypr. Angl. ad an. 1611.) He was, among his other preferments, Rector of Whitchurch, Salop, where he died, Feb. 8, 1639.]

[m] [This was Henry Airay, who had 'picked a quarrel' with Laud 'about his sermon.' (See Diary, Oct. 21, 1606.) The new Principal of S. Edmund's Hall, Adam Airay, was his relation. He was not admitted Principal till March 9.]

the papers which he brought concerning your claim, you shall hear further from me. In the meantime, I cannot take the business well. So I leave you to the grace of God, and rest

Your neglected Friend,

GUIL. LONDON.

London House, Feb. 11, 1630.

To the right worshipful my good friend, Dr. Potter, Provost of Queen's Coll. in Oxford, These.

LETTER XXXIV.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Chaur. Viror. ad Vossium Epistt., Epist. cxxxiii. pp. 86, 87 *.]

Salutem in Christo.

Literas hodie tibi debeo binas; totidem enim accepi °, nec reddidi. Sum in hoc genere æris solvendo paulo tardior. Et certe aliquid tantum est, quod possim solvere. Tanta enim mole negotiorum gravatus sum, ut aliquid sit, et sæpius, quod mihimetipsi debeo, nec solvere possum, quidni ergo et amicis aliquando? Et quod nunc in hoc scribendi officio tibi non desim, gratias ago stylo huic contractiori, qui hoc unum novit, multa paucis concludere.

Intelligo ex utrisque literis tuis metum injectum esse Lugdunensibus, non solum ne te amitterent, sed et ne Academiam; saltem ne Professores quosque digniores ad se allicerent Amstelodamenses. Eos autem primores juvenum facile sequuntur, sicut illi præmia ampliora. Et quid sine his Academia? Superest, ut vel stipendia adaugeant Leidenses, quod in bonum cedet Professoribus; aut ut Professores Amstelodamum concedant, quod malum minatur Academiæ; quin et civitati etiam, quæ ex frequentia studentium ditior facta, nec cupit, scio, lucrum dediscere. Reliqua, in tantum te spectant, cupio audire, sed quum causa finita est, et quum statio tua fixa.

Filium tuum salvum et reducem gestio videre. Hoc bene

* [Exstat etiam, magna vero sui parte mutila, apud Præst. ac Erudit. Viror. Epistt., Epist. dv. p. 765.]

° [Vide G. J. Vossii Epistt. cxl. (pp. 172, 173.) cl. (pp. 182, 183.)]

est, sed male quod abiit me nesciente. Quid? Ut ad te, quem tanti facio, quanti, spero, nosti, abeat filius tuus sine me? Iterum (si quæ occasio detur) non faciet spero. Et unice probo, quod tam cito remiseris. Non quasi de progressu ipsius, dum apud te, dubium ullum, sed ne in Collegii statuta peccaret.

Si quæ parata habeas, nolim ut abscondas. Nosti quid sit, Lucerna sub modio. Nec erit male posita opera, si scripta illa, quæ ut antiqua sunt, ita ante hoc sæculum pæne antiquata, e pulvere suo extrahas, iisque aliquid lucis addas. Semper tamen inculco Baronium, et eo magis quia Ecclesia (sic enim scribis) summa votorum tibi.

Franc. Junius[p] rediit in Britanniam citius multo quam opinabar, utpote qui satis novi, quo animo in Gallias profectus sit.

Attulit secum literas ab amplissimo viro Hugone Grotio ad me datas. Gratissimæ illæ (virum enim illum doctissimum semper agnovi), sed rescribendi otium non datur. Nota etiam mihi probitas et eruditio Junii, nec opus, ut a te habeam illum commendatiorem. Scias velim, me et tui, et Grotii, et sui causa facturum quod possum.

Victoriæ Principis vestri gratulor. Cedat precor in gloriam Dei et bonum Ecclesiæ. De prudentia ipsius et virtute militum, non est apud me dubium; sed si iterum et in mari non rubro Israelem præivit nebula, date quæ sunt Cæsaris Cæsari, et quæ sunt Dei Deo.

De filio tuo iterum. Et iterum si placeat. Nam cur non et hic duplex primogeniti portio? Certe mihi curæ erit, quamdiu ipse sibi. Tu eum hortare, ut facis. Et quo magis te et tua in eo conspexero, eo majori cura me eum prosecuturum spondeo. Quod reliquum, te, et illum, et tuos Deo fovendos commendo. Et quum fuerit opportunum, te rogo, ut nomine meo virum illum spectatissimum Hug. Grotium [salutes], eique pro literis per Junium missis gratias agas. Hoc facto scias me

Amicum semper tibi fore

Fidelissimum,

Novemb. 7, 1631. GUIL. LONDON.

[p] [Vide supra, p. 277.]

LETTER XXXV.

TO THOMAS COMBER, MASTER OF TRINITY COLLEGE.

[Prynne's Cant. Doom, p. 363.]

I am sorry you have been troubled at Cambridge with the distempered speeches of any men in the pulpit. And I must confess, I heard of both the particulars you mention before I received your letter. That in St. John's, it seems, they have punished; and you do very worthily to join with them, in case anything for the public shall be further requisite. And as for Mr. Bernard[q], I am the more sorry for him, because he is in London, within my charge. Nevertheless, if he have done unworthily, I shall be very ready to assist you and the University, in what I may be able. And since you gave a decree to the Beadle to convent him, and he slipped away the while, I will do the best I can to send him back, there to be answerable to the government against which he hath offended. And if he shall refuse to do so, without giving better reason than I think he can, I shall certainly suspend him till he do it. So, in haste, I leave you, &c.

W. LONDON.

Endorsed: May 27, 1632.
A clause of my letter to Dr. Comber concerning Mr. Bernard.

LETTER XXXVI.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Claror. Viror. ad Vossium Epistt., Epist. cxlix. pp. 100, 101[r].]

VIR ILLUSTRISSIME,—Literæ tuæ Id. Februariis datæ[s] nuper ad me delatæ sunt. In quibus, quod mihi gratissimum, lego pro Amstelodamensibus pronunciatum esse, et te ibi inauguratum. Cedant tibi in bonum omnia. Spero enim te, Numine propitio valde, sedem, non studia, mutasse. Sti-

[q] [Nathaniel Bernard, Lecturer at St. Sepulchre's in London, in preaching at St. Mary's in Cambridge, May 6, 1632, "uttered some offensive words concerning some ceremonies and rites used in some churches," as Comber the Vice-Chancellor informed Laud. See Prynne's Cant. Doom, p. 363.]

[r] [Exstat etiam, magna vero sui parte mutila, in locis autem quibusdam emendatior, apud Præst. ac Erudit. Viror. Epistt., Epist. dviii. p. 767.]

[s] [Vide G. J. Vossii Epist. clviii. pp. 189, seq.]

pendium altera parte majus usui erit tuis, quod paucioribus horis publice doceas, erit tibi et studiis.

Casaubonus[t] a morte Reverendissimi Wintoniensis[u] in meam clientelam transiit. Ego Patris nomine et suo, quæ potui feci, ut liber a curis studiis indulgeret; quibus æque ac majoribus conatibus (si majores sint) res domi augustiores obstare solent. Alia et majora facturus sum, quum facultas adsit[v], et erit opportunum. Interim gaudeo tot nominibus tibi gratum accessisse Casauboni Optatum[x]. Si qua in re aurem tibi vellat, spero mitius agit, nollem enim, ut quid durius, quum tantis sis occupationibus distentus, nec vellem ut aliis quam tuis passibus, et quibus feliciter possis, progrediaris.

Armachanus certe noster[y] Vir doctus et gravis librum tibi dicatum, a se scriptum[z] ad me misit. Gratias egi, ut par erat; nam valde mihi Præsul ille ob multiplicem doctrinam charus. Sed quum primum inspexi, nonnulla occurrebant, quæ mihi raptim (prout res meæ exigunt) legenti non ita arrisere. Præcipue vero ille S. Aug. sensus restrictior, qui venerabilem illum Patrem nec antiquioribus in Ecclesia, nec sibi ipsi, constare permisit. Gratias vero tibi ago summas, quod (etsi paucis id a te factum) significare placuit, in quibus necesse tibi sit a viro tanto dissentire. Dignare, obsecro, si per otium liceat, pleniori calamo, breviter tamen, ea, et si quæ alia sunt, describere, et ad me transmittere, in privatum tantum usum vertenda.

De amplissimo illo Viro Hu. Grotio pauca habeo. Salutes, quæso, virum doctissimum meis nominibus. Fac etiam, ut sciat gratum mihi admodum fuisse, quod calculo ejus dignissimo indignissimus approbatus sim, quod ex ipsius ad Casaubonum literis intellexi[a]. Cæterum reditum ejus in patriam fateor mihi semper fuisse inter res vix credibiles, cujuscunque demum suasu fuerit. Nec deest mihi ratio, etsi non hic et nunc inserenda. Si iterum sponte patria excedat, felix est,

[t] [Méricus Casaubonus, Isaaci filius, admissus ad Eccl. Cant. Canonicatum, Junii 19, 1628.]

[u] [Lanceloti Andrewes, qui obierat Sept. 25, 1626.]

[v] [Contulit ei Laudus, tum Archiep. Cantuar., Vicariam de Minster, Oct. 4, 1635, et Vicariam de Monkton, Oct. 25, ejusd. anni.]

[x] [Ediderat Optatum una cum Notis et Observationibus, Londini. 1631.]

[y] [Jacobus Usserius, Archiep. Armach.]

[z] [Gotteschalci et Prædestinarianæ Controversiæ ab eo motæ Historiam, editam Eblanæ, A.D. 1631.]

[a] [Vide Merici Casauboni ad has Hug. Grotii literas responsum apud Merici Casauboni Epist. p. 3. Roterod. 1709.]

quod eum tot reges principesque desiderant. Hoc uno infelicior, quod non tam, aut facile, aut tuto, eligere potest, atque eligi. Quod præ aliis invides eum Britanniæ, placet id quidem, et quàm utilis esse potest, non magis scīo quam agnosco. Sed, ut nunc res sunt apud nos, de ea re ne cogitandum quidem.

Quod interjicis de turbis Lugdunensibus, et capitis supplicio irrogato homicidæ[b], certe non sine dolore audio hæc et similia de Academiis. Inter pessimos mores quid restat, si occidere, vel occidi, sit Academice vivere? Felix tamen Lugdunum vestrum, quod inter tam crebras cædes, tot habet tamen nobiles, quotidie illuc advolantes studii et eruditionis causa, auditque Asylum juventutis. Sed non sic olim crevere literæ.

Quod reliquum est (nam alia me avocant), cura valetudinem, ut diu usui esse possis Ecclesiæ Christi. Ævum schismaticum dicis; nec audeo abnuere. Interim necesse est ferre, quod nec vitare potes, nec corrigere. Et certe morbus adeo complicatus est, ut nescio quem potest Medicum exspectare, præter Deum. Auctorem salutis nostræ dum precibus sollicitas, sis mei memor. Vale.

Tui studiosissimus,

GUIL. LONDON.

Julii 3, 1632.

Fere inter scribendum accepi orationem a te publice habitam, certe doctissimam, de Utilitate Historiæ. Gratias ago maximas.

LETTER XXXVII.

TO THE LORD VISCOUNT WENTWORTH.

[Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 57, 58[c].]

Salutem in Christo.

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I humbly thank you for your noble letters to me, and I cannot doubt of your assurance to me.

[b] [Iste homicida "fuit ex famulitio Principis Razevilii, eo tempore apud Lugdunenses degentis." Vide Vossii Epist. clviii. p. 190.]

[c] [This letter is placed by Knowler in 1631; but it obviously belongs to 1632, as Wentworth was not made Deputy of Ireland till Jan. 7, 163½; also, Moreton was not made Bishop of Durham till June 1632.]

I am glad to hear from so good a hand as your Lordship's, that my Lord Newcastle[d] is so well affected to me. You know I had need hold some friends; and, certainly, if his Lordship come into the south, to me he must be welcome, to whomsoever he be not; and, if it were in my power to hold him here, the north should not have him again in haste. I hope they are as well minded to him, that have more power.

Mr. Secretary Windebank[e] takes himself much bound to your Lordship, and hath lately expressed so much to you by his own letters.

The same day that I received letters from your Lordship about Smart[f], I received the like from my Lord his Grace of York[g]; they came to me at Oatlands. There I acquainted his Majesty with it, and read my Lord of York's letter to him, and left it in his hands to give to Mr. Secretary Coke, that he might write presently down about it. I acquainted the King likewise with the passage in your letter. I hope your Lordship, and the Commissioners there, will make that most unworthy Dean an example[h].

For Dr. Carr[i] I have moved, and have obtained in your name what you desire for him. But I must tell your Lordship, fifty miles is a great distance; and the King was marvellous strict; yet he said he would not deny it you, being to leave those parts for his better service[k]. Yet this he requires, that Dr. Carr shall, within the space of two years, bring himself within the distance of thirty miles,

[d] [William Cavendish, created Earl of Newcastle, March 7, 1628; Marquess of Newcastle, Oct. 27, 1643; and Duke of Newcastle, March 16, 1664: a most accomplished person, and also actively employed on the side of the King in the great Rebellion. The Archbishop bequeathed him his best diamond ring. (See Will.)]

[e] [Sir Francis Windebank, so frequently mentioned in the Diary.]

[f] [Peter Smart, Prebendary of the fourth stall in Durham Cathedral. He preached, in 1628, two celebrated sermons on "The Vanity and Downfall of Superstition and Popish Ceremonies," for which he was deprived in the High-Commission Court. He was released by the Long Parliament, and retaliated by instituting a prosecution against Cosin and others. See vol. iv. pp. 40, 293.]

[g] [Richard Neile.]

[h] [Dr. Hunt, who appears to have favoured Smart.]

[i] [Thomas Carr, Prebendary of the fourth stall in Durham Cathedral. He was presented by Lord Strafford to the livings of Hungate and Aycliffe, and attended him at his murder on the scaffold. (Walker's Sufferings, p. 20.)]

[k] [Wentworth had, a few months before, been appointed Lord Deputy of Ireland.]

which the canon of the Church allows. And of this I heartily pray your Lordship to take the best care you can, to help him to an exchange. For the world will be apt to think this is my doing, and that I make too little conscience of distance. This to your letters.

Now, my Lord, what do you, or have you done, about Dr. Bramhall for the prebend? For my Lord of Durham is actually translated, and so out of it[l].

And what do you mean to do for your journey into Ireland? Will you stay till August be past, and put yourself upon the flaws of September in that broken sea? Have you courted, you know whom, all this while (for I have nothing but what Cassius tells me), to take no better company with you than Michaelmas Riggs? If you do not make haste, I profess I cannot tell what to say to your journey. You may find more danger in a ship to Ireland, than over the Thames in a skuller. Did ever Brutus or Cassius do thus or thus at Tiber?

One business more I must acquaint you with: the Lord Mountnorris[m], when he went, spake with me to get him a chaplain, a sober man and a good scholar. His intentions are very honourable, but too long for a letter. He told me, the party (if I could fit him) was to come over with your Lordship. I have, I think, fitted his desires[n]; but whether my Lord acquainted you with this or not, I cannot tell. I thought fit, however, to tell you of it; for I should be loth to have him prepare himself, and then be left behind; the rest of this you shall have, when I have the happiness to see you. I hear my Lord Bishop of Lincoln[o] uses my name at his pleasure, and strangely, if all be true I hear. God forgive him, and I do. But I hope He will preserve me from such inveterate malice. This is too long too, and not worth repeating. I will hope he is misreported to me.

[l] [Thomas Moreton, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, had been confirmed Bishop of Durham the previous July 2. The stall which Bramhall held in York Cathedral was Husthwaite, to which he was not admitted till June 13, 1633. See Bramhall's Works, vol. i. p. xvii.]

[m] [Francis Annesley, created Baron Mountnorris in 1628.]

[n] [The person who was selected was James Croxton, of whom see more in vol. iv. p. 288, note [s]. He is frequently mentioned below in the course of these Letters.]

[o] [John Williams, Laud's bitter opponent.]

My Lord Marshall[p] and his Lady[q] are gone towards Cumberland. I presume they have, or will see you in those parts, where I shall now never have the honour to see you, if I should lose my way again between Rotherham and Rouslye Bar. So, wishing you all health and happiness, I leave you to the grace of God, and rest

Your Lordship's most affectionate

Friend and Servant,

GUIL. LONDON.

July 30, 1631 [*leg.* 1632].

LETTER XXXVIII.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Apud Claror. Viror. ad Vossium Epistt., Epist. clxi. p. 105[r].]

Salutem in Christo.

Junius[s] vester nosterque, vos et nativum solum repetit. Causa itineris est Comes Arundelianus, cui jam feliciter servit. Comes ille, non genere clarior quam virtutibus, Legatus Regius ad sororem Reginam Bohemiæ[t], ad vos proficiscitur; tum ut ei solatio sit graviter amissum maritum dolenti; tum ut eam, si ita Deo et Reginæ visum fuerit, in Angliam reducat. Hinc occasionem avide arripiens Junius, me gaudio perfusus adit, et vos desiderio prius, quam ulnis, amplectitur. Quæris ergo cur Junius sine literis meis? Certe non est, quod nihil habeam, quod scribam, scribo enim (ut vides) etsi nihil: sed, non inscio Junio aliis manibus literas meas credidi, ut juvenis hic, præclaræ certe indolis, qualemqualem occasionem habeat te videndi, et meo nomine salutandi. Filius autem est, et natu quidem maximus honoratissimi DD. Francisci Windebank[u], Regiæ Majestatis nuper Secretarii, et a Consiliis; viri ut alias dignissimi, ita mihi per annos triginta et amplius amicissimi. Juvenem hunc eo amore, quo amicos beare soles, prosequere, et omnia quæ nunc petenda sunt perfecisti. Velim etiam, ut Junio gratias

[p] [Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel.]

[q] [Alathea, daughter and co-heir of Gilbert Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury.]

[r] [Exstat etiam, maxima vero parte sui mutila, apud Præst. ac Erudit. Viror. Epistt., Epist. dxvi. p. 771.]

[s] [Vide supra, p. 277.]

[t] [Vide tom. iii. p. 216, note [k].]

[u] [Thomas Windebank, de quo plura apud Prynne, 'Hidden Works,' pp. 144, seq.]

agas, quod hic amici mei filius ei curæ sit. Quod nec multis, nec sæpius scribo, negotia mea in causa sunt, non animus. Baronium tamen etiam nunc inculco, et scis quid magnopere velim. Hoc etiam habe; me omnia fecisse, et facturum, quæ Grotio nostro dignissimo, aut honori sunt, aut usui esse possunt. Reliqua Dei sunt. Vale, et quoties Deum adoras, pro me ores; sum enim

Tibi in Christo amicissimus,

GUIL. LOND.

Lond. Decembr. 26, 1632.

LETTER XXXIX.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Ibid. Epist. cxxxvii. p. 90.]

Salutem in Christo.

Nudiusquintus scripsi ad te, Vir Clarissime. Nuncius tum et Junius tuus et Windebankus meus. Quum literas illas ad te dedi, prorsus nihil rescivi de filio tuo, nisi quod omnia bene Cantabrigiæ. Quum ecce literæ ab amicis meis intimis, et qui tibi filioque optime vovent, ad me properant. Clamant filium tuum, non otiosum tantum, sed et pene dissolutum. Deus bone, qualis mutatio, et quam inexpectata! Doleo valde, sed tua interest, ut quam proximum rescires. Aiunt illum, amore puellæ, et famæ non satis integræ (utpote degentis in diversorio) captum esse. Si matrimonium contrahat et tale, quantus dolor! Statim in ipso Nunc literarum istarum scripsi ad illos, ut omnia facerent, quæ ægrum filium tuum possint sanare, aut saltem impedire, ne sic miser pereat. Societas enim, qua fruitur in Collegio Jesu, illa altera Societate perditur, et unde vitam quæret nescio. Consilium dant amici, nec aliud ego, ut tu quam citissime tanquam aliud volens filium accersas, celerrimum reditum promittas, sed quum in tuam, i. e. patriam potestatem devenerit, potes alia et salubria consilia capere. Num Junius abeuns eum non adiit? Num adiit, et nihil est suspicatus novi. Deus bone, quam male me habet animus! A tempore quo a te redux (diu id mihi videtur) me non invisit. Quum hoc audio, jubeo literas hasce meas volare, ut tu jubeas reditum

filii tui, saniora spero consilia inituri, quum te viderit. Vale, et me ama, ut mihi molestum est hæc scribere.

Tibi amic.

Jan. 4, 1632
Stylo nostro.

GUIL. LONDIN.

LETTER XL.

TO G. J. VOSSIUS.

[Ibid. Epist. cxl. pp. 92, 93 [x].]

Salutem in Christo.

VIR CLARISSIME, Admodum gratæ mihi sunt literæ tuæ [y], ut semper, ita nunc præcipue. Diu enim expetii brevem, sed magis dilucidam sententiæ Godescalsianæ Expositionem, quam ullibi adhuc mihi videre contigit. Et certe lis illa de gratia et libero arbitrio eo inauspicatius mota mihi videtur, quia vix ulli, qui a primis ante S. Aug. Patribus recesserunt, tam feliciter rem aggressi sunt, ac priores illi. Nunc literæ tuæ, et chartulæ inclusæ, mihi et votis meis abunde satisfecerunt, et gratias ago. Si quæ tamen sunt, quæ post uberiorem disquisitionem prolixius placet scribere, mihi certe pergratissima futura sunt.

Exercitationes Grammaticæ tibi forsan (ut res tuæ sunt) necessariæ editu, aliis proculdubio utiles, mihi acceptiores futuræ, nisi te a Baronio avocarent. Summopere enim cupio historiam veteris Ecclesiæ a te aut compositam, aut limatam videre; id est, a præjudiciis, et contrariarum factionum interpolationibus liberatam.

Gratulor tibi de Dionysio tuo [z], quod annum vix egressus vigesimum tam alta sapiat. Si Rabbi Mos. Maimonidis transferre ex Hebræo cogitat, et auctor placet et argumentum, sc. de Idololatriæ Exordiis et Progressu. De nomine, cui inscribere decrevit opus tam insigne, id mihi voluptati erit, quod placet vobis [a]. Interim carmina ejus, quæ geminum implent Panegyricum, Principi Arausioniensium debita [b], avidius per-

[x] [Prior hujus Epistolæ pars exstat quoque apud Præst. ac Erud. Viror. Epistt., Epist. dxvii. pp. 771, 772.]

[y] [Vide G. J. Vossii Epist. clxxxvi. p. 208.]

[z] [De quo in Epist. superius citata Vossius ad Laudum scripserat.]

[a] [Voluit librum suum Laudo inscribere. Vide Vossii Epist. p. 209.]

[b] [Vide ibid. p. 210.]

legi, sed (ut soleo) propere nimis præ negotiis, quæ me non a studiis modo, sed et meipso divellunt.

Et utinam hic laus Dionysii terminus esse posset Epistolæ hujus, sed Johannes id non patitur, nec literæ tuæ per Junium nostrum allatæ [c]. De amoribus illis si antea audivisti, eo doleo magis, quod monitis tuis, non dico, spretis, neglectis tamen, ullam cum ea consuetudinem ulterius foveret. Si nolit uxorem, cur vult consuetudinem? Cur famam placet alere in proprium dedecus? Si extremæ dementiæ sit projicere se infra sortem suam, certe vix minoris est, id agere, quo magis fama frustra scindatur sua. Negat hæc omnia, audio, et spero vere. Sed vera sint illa de nuptiis, sive non, certum est et horas male collocare bonas, et æs alienum contrahere, quæ duo, sola ut sint, ferenda non sunt. Hæc autem ita se habere, potes e chartula hac inclusa scire. Clausula est literarum Doctoris Beli, Collegii Jesu apud Cantabrigienses Præpositi [d], quas nuperrime ad me misit. Belus lingua vernacula scripsit, literas ejus Latinas fecit inelegantior calamus.

Junius statim a reditu et me consuluit, et Cantabrigiam petiit. Rediens inde me frustra quæsivit, ut quem negotia alibi magis detinent quam domi. Id tantum servo meo concredidit, intra triduum aut eo circiter adfuturum filium tuum. Ecce paro literas, sed nimis propere scriptas, et de filio tuo nihil habent, quod addant. A Junio ea spero accipies. Si bona sint, tecum gaudeo; si alia, et non pessima, potes id agere, Deo propitio, ut quum ad te venerit filius, redimatur quam queas minimo, sive damno, sive periculo. Gravia certe hæc sunt, sed ad meliorem se frugem recipiet filius, si forte (ut fertur) aberravit. Deus te diu incolumem servet tibi, tuis, et mihi

Nominis et meriti
tui Cultori,

Feb. 15, 1632, GUIL. LONDIN.
Comp. nostro.

Hucusque filium tuum exspectavi frustra. Cantabrigia Londinum decessit, antequam ego has literas scripsi. Si alas mutuatus est, quibus ad te volet, bene est. Sed timeo omnia. Iterum vale.

[c] [Vide Vossii Epist. cxci. p. 212.]
[d] [Guil. Belus, de quo plura videas apud 'Walker's Sufferings,' p. 148.]

LETTER XLI.

TO THE LORD VISCOUNT WENTWORTH.

[Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 81, 82.]

S. in Christo.

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I humbly and heartily pray you to give me leave to recommend these particulars following both to your memory and your justice, so soon as it pleases God you shall be settled in Ireland. And that you will be pleased to consider of so many particulars, as concern the Church and religion, with as much favour as justice can give way unto.

1. I humbly pray your Lordship to remember what you have promised me concerning the Church at Dublin[e], which hath for divers years been used for a stable by your predecessors; and to vindicate it to God's service, as you shall there examine, and find the merits of the cause.

2. That you would be pleased to consider of the business proposed by the Lord Viscount Mayo, so far as you shall find it honourable, and for the King's service; and let his Lordship know, that, according to my word, I have remembered it.

3. That you would be pleased, when old Mr. Matchet brings my letters to you, about the rights of his parsonage, to preserve him and the Church's cause, so far as you shall find it just, for his adversary is potent.

4. That in the great cause of the Impropriations, which are yet remaining in his Majesty's gift, and which he is most graciously willing to give back to God and His service, you will do whatsoever may justly be done for the honour and service of our two great masters, God, and the King; that you would countenance and assist the Lord Primate of Armagh in all things belonging to this great service. And particularly for the procuring of a true and just valuation of them, that the King may know what he gives the Church. I pray, my Lord, be hearty in this, for I shall think myself

[e] [S. Andrew's church. See Letter from the Lords Justices to the Lord Deputy, Feb. 26, 1631. (Strafforde Letters, vol. i. p. 68.)]

very happy, if God be pleased to spare my life to see this business ended.

5. I would also pray your Lordship to give the Lord Bishop of Limerick[f] that fair and just hearing, which I know you will not deny to any; the rather because the said Bishop pretends in his letter to me, that he desires nothing but justice[g].

6. The next is a particular business concerning St. John's College in Oxford; to which college Dr. Michael Boyle[h], now Bishop of Waterford, is indebted thirty-five pounds, as appears by note under Dr. Juxon's hand, then President of the college[i], which I here deliver your Lordship. I presume he cannot be so unworthy as to deny the debt. If he be, I here send your Lordship the bond itself, which he entered to the college according to course, when he was made Fellow; and two letters which himself sent to me, while I was President, acknowledging the debt, and desiring forbearance. I pray your Lordship the college may be no longer deluded by him, but that you will be honourably pleased to receive the college money, and deliver him his bond, or call him to a legal account, if he refuse, that we may once have an end of this business.

7. There is one Christopher Sands, who, as I am informed, dwells now in Londonderry, and teaches an English school there; and I do much fear he doth many things there, to the dishonour of God, and the endangering of many poor souls.

[f] [Francis Gough, consecrated September 17, 1626, died August 26, 1634.]

[g] [This case is thus mentioned in the letter written December 1633, by Wentworth to Laud, in which he gives an account of the progress he had made in his 'Church-work':—"My Lord of Limerick had likewise a suit with one Streatch, which continued many years, and the Bishop not anything the nearer. The matter concerned 80*l.* a year, given by one Lofthouse (whose daughter and heir this Streatch since married) to the Catholic Bishop of Limerick, intending sure the Roman; but we hold ours the Catholic Bishop, and therefore have rectified the knowledge of the donor, and applied it to the right bishop indeed. So it is ordered at the Board, that Streatch shall convey and release all his interest to the Church, and take back a lease of one-and-twenty years from the bishop, paying 40*l.* rent, and 40*l.* fine." It is added, in the margin of this passage, "that Lofthouse was moved to restore these lands, and a stone house of his own, forth of remorse of conscience, by recompence for the lands he had *mala fide* taken the benefit of from the Church."—Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 171, 172.]

[h] [Michael Boyle was elected Scholar of St. John's in 1593. He came first to Ireland as Dean of Lismore, and was consecrated, in 1619, Bishop of Waterford.]

[i] [Juxon was President of St. John's from November 19, 1621, to 1632.]

For the party is a Jew, and denies both Christ and His Gospel; as I shall be able to prove, if I had him here. I humbly pray your Lordship, that he may be seized on by authority, and sent over in safe custody, and delivered either to myself, or to Mr. Mottershed, the Register of the High-Commission, that he may not live there to infect his Majesty's subjects.

8. I am likewise commanded by his Majesty to deliver your Lordship a clause of a letter sent unto me by the Lord Primate of Armagh, Novr. 1st, 1632, with which I acquainted his Majesty. At which time his princely pleasure was, that your Lordship should assure the Lord Primate, that he would see the jurisdiction of the Church established there, to be maintained, against both recusants, and other factionists whatsoever; and that you should do your best endeavour to stop all such occasions as may dishearten the bishops in God's service and his. This branch of the letter I also here deliver to your Lordship.

9. I further pray your Lordship to take notice by the Lord Primate of Armagh, of the readiness of the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland[k] to set forwards the maintenance of the ministers in that kingdom, and to encourage him to advance the same. As also to move the Lord Chief Justice for his opinion, what legal course he shall think fittest may be held for the present means of curates out of the impropriations in Ireland; which I am credibly informed his Lordship is very able, and willing to give.

10. I heartily pray your Lordship to take notice of young Mr. Croxton[l], whom I send over with your Lordship to the Lord Mountnorris. I hope he will prove so honest and so able a man, as may do good service to those parts, if God bless him with life. And I doubt not, but, as it shall fall in your way, your Lordship will bestow some preferment upon him for his maintenance, for which I will thank you, and rest

Your Lordship's loving poor
Friend to serve you,
GUIL. LONDON.

April 30, 1633.

[k] [Sir George Shurley.]

[l] [See above, p. 302.]

LETTER XLII.

TO THE LORD VISCOUNT WENTWORTH.

[Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 110, 111.]

Salutem in Christo.

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I heartily thank your Lordship for all your love, and for the joy you are pleased both to conceive and express for my translation to Canterbury; for I conceive all your expressions to me are very hearty, and such I have hitherto found them. And now, since I am there, (for my translation is to be on Thursday, Sept. 19th,) I must desire your Lordship not to expect more at my hands than I shall be able to perform, either in Church or State; and this suit of mine hath a great deal of reason in it, for you write, that ordinary things are far beneath that which you cannot choose but promise yourself of me in both respects. But, my Lord, to speak freely, you may easily promise more in either kind than I can perform. For, as for the Church, it is so bound up in the forms of the common law, that it is not possible for me, or for any man, to do that good which he would, or is bound to do. For your Lordship sees, no man clearer, that they which have gotten so much power in and over the Church, will not let go their hold; they have, indeed, fangs with a witness, whatsoever I was once said in passion to have. And for the State, indeed, my Lord, I am for 'thorough,' but I see that both thick and thin stays somebody, where I conceive it should not; and it is impossible for me to go thorough alone. Besides, private ends are such blocks in the public way, and lie so thick, that you may promise what you will, and I must perform what I can, and no more.

Next, my Lord, I thank you heartily for your kind wishes to me, that God would send me many and happy days where I now am to be. Amen. I can do little for myself, if I cannot say so; but truly, my Lord, I look for neither: not for many, for I am in years, and have had a troublesome life; not for happy, because I have no hope to do the good I desire; and, besides, I doubt I shall never be able to hold my health

there one year; for instead of all the jolting which I had over the stones between London House and Whitehall, which was almost daily, I shall have now no exercise, but slide over in a barge to the Court and Star-Chamber; and in truth, my Lord, I speak seriously, I have had a heaviness hang upon me ever since I was nominated to this place, and I can give myself no account of it, unless it proceed from an apprehension that there is more expected from me than the craziness of these times will give me leave to do.

That there is a sharp contention between the Seculars and the Regulars in Ireland[m], and that the titular Archbishop of Dublin[n] sides as a Benedictine with the Regulars, is no news to me; for my Lord Primate, I thank him, hath sent me over some of the books which have been written and printed in that argument; but the habit both of the Bishop and Priests, I swear by his Grace's stockings, is as new as blue. Indeed, my Lord, I did not think to hear of a clergy so suited on that party. I should not much have wondered had it been Knox and his fellows; but your Lordship may see by this to what contempt and scorn the rents and divisions of the Church have brought many of all parties; but I, for my part, must acknowledge the judgment just.

For the matter itself, since you are pleased to ask such advice, as I can give; First, I know no reason of state why you should cooperate to set the contrary party at one. Secondly, I know no reason in religion why a superior should excommunicate any man for suing his civil rights in the civil courts of justice, especially if he break no canon of the Church in the manner of pursuit. In which case, if your Lordship do prosecute the Archbishop, by the King's Attorney, for not recalling such his excommunication, I think you shall do but your duty. Nevertheless, if he shall send to his superiors to consult whether he shall recal his excommunication or no, (as I verily think he will,) I should think, because this is a leading case, it were not amiss for your Lordship to communicate it to the Lords of the Council here, and then you may be the more ready for what answer soever his superiors

[m] [See some papers relating to this dispute in Prynne's Hidden Works, pp. 106—109.]

[n] [Thomas Fleming. He is called a Franciscan in the Protest of the Romish Bishops, ibid. p. 107.]

shall give him; but this I submit to your Lordship's better judgment.

Now, my Lord, why may you not write, as whilom you did to the Bishop of London? The man is the same, and the same to you; but I see you stay for better acquaintance; and till then you will keep distance. I perceive, also, my predecessor's awe is upon you, but I doubt I shall never hold it long; and I was about to swear by my troth, as you do, but I remember oaths heretofore were wont to pass under the Privy Seal, and not the ordinary seal of letters. Well, wiser or not, you must take that as you find it; but I will not write any long letters and leave out my mirth, it is one of the recreations I have always used with my friends, and 'tis hard leaving an old custom, neither do I purpose to do it; though I mean to make choice of my friends, to whom I will use it. For proof of this, I here send your Lordship some sermon notes which I have received from Cambridge; and, certainly, if this be your method there, you ride as much aside as ever Croxton did towards Ireland. I wish your Lordship all health and happiness, and so leave you to the grace of God, ever resting

Your Lordship's very loving poor Servant,

W. CANT. ELECT.

Fulham, Sept. 9th, 1633.

LETTER XLIII.

FROM JOHN WILLIAMS, BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

[Lambeth MSS. Numb. mxxx. p. 10[p].]

MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD AND MY VERY GOOD LORD, —My duty and all due respects remembered, I do, in the first place, congratulate with your Grace, or rather with

[p] [The letters of Bp. Williams, now printed for the first time in this collection from the originals in Lambeth Library, are introduced, not only for the purpose of making the Archbishop's replies intelligible, but also to illustrate the position in which these leading Churchmen stood to each

this happy and flourishing Church of England, that it hath pleased God to put it into his Majesty's heart to advance your Grace's person, so full of great parts and abilities, and withal so acceptable unto his Majesty, to be Primate of all England, and the Metropolitan of this province. And do must humbly and willingly offer unto your Grace my best service and attendance, either on your Consecration, as one of your Grace's poor Officers, or in any other way, as one of your Grace's Bishops or Suffragans.

Lindwood, l. 5. titul. 'DePœnis c. 'æterno verbo 'ta quam.'

In the next place, protesting sincerely in the presence of God, that whatsoever, or from what man soever your Grace hath heard aught to the contrary, yet that in truth I did never, in all the time of my being in any nearness unto the late King or his Majesty that now is, either offer (willingly) any wrong, or omit any act of true and sincere friendship and respect unto your Grace, whom (as all men know, that know me) I esteemed one of my best and ablest friends in those times. This protestation, I say, sincerely premised in the presence of Almighty God, I humbly beseech your Grace to procure my peace with the King's Majesty, that resting in his favour, as others of his Majesty's ordinary Bishops and Chaplains, I may, for this short remainder of my life, serve God more quietly, and his Majesty more cheerfully and comfortably, and yet in no other ways and directions than his Majesty, by your Grace, to whom it now most properly belongeth, shall chalk and appoint me.

And for the favourers of Puritans or Sectaries, with whom I am most injuriously treated to comply so much, I renounce them all, of what sort or condition soever they be, from the cedar in Lebanon to the hyssop weeping upon the wall; and shall not be offended if all the world be acquainted with my profession in this kind, but shall always be ready to make it appear unto your Grace, that this great diocese, God's name be praised for it, is more free from unconformable ministers than ever it hath been these

other. The volume of MSS. from which they are transcribed, contains much other interesting matter relating to Bishop Williams. There is given, in the commencement of the volume, an account of the manner in which it came into the Archiepiscopal Library.]

sixty years; and had been so many years ago, if I had been as fortunate as other Bishops in the ability and faithfulness of those Ecclesiastical Officers, which my predecessors' patents have pinned upon me.

And so, my good Lord, being no more ready to receive that great favour in this kind from your Grace than I shall ever be, if not to deserve, yet to acknowledge it, I beseech God Almighty to preserve your Grace, and shall ever remain

Your Grace's most humble

Servant and Suffragan,

JO. LINCOLN.

To the Most Rev. Father in God, his very good Lord Archbishop Elect of Canterbury His Grace, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, present these.

Endorsed:—'Recep. Sep. 9, 1633. My Ld. Bp. of Lincoln's Letter to me to move his Majesty, &c.'

LETTER XLIV.

TO JOHN WILLIAMS, BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

[Lambeth MSS. Numb. mxxx. p. 11 [q].]

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I received your Lordship's letters about the middle of the last week, by the hands of Mr. Secretary Windebank; and had there been nothing in them but what I could have answered by myself, your Lordship should not have stayed so long for these of mine; but in that you desired from me a good office to the King, and who was then gone to Bagshot, I could neither do it, nor give your Lordship an account of it, till after this Sunday that I had spoken with his Majesty.

And now, my Lord, I shall distinctly answer to the three

[q] [These letters of Archbishop Laud to Bishop Williams, are not originals, as those of the Bishop, but are all in the handwriting of his amanuensis, and were evidently the copies preserved by him for future reference.]

parts into which you have divided your letters. And for the first, which is your congratulation, I heartily thank you for it; and I pray God give me that ability for the discharge of the place which your Lordship seems to suppose in me. I thank your Lordship, likewise, for your readiness to come up at this time to my translation; but before I knew that it stood with your liking and occasions, there were other Bishops named, upon whom I must now rely; and my day is so near (being Thursday next, the 19th of this present September) that I cannot hope these letters can come to your Lordship's hands much sooner than the very time.

For the second, which contains your Lordship's serious protestation, that in all the time of your nearness to King James, of blessed memory, or his Majesty that now is, you never did me wittingly any ill office; I leave it to your Lordship's truth and sincerity, and, howsoever, have no will at all to rake into anything that is past, and have, therefore, according to your Lordship's desires, very seriously and earnestly moved the procuring of your peace with his Majesty.

The King gave me a fair and a full hearing, and when I had done, commanded me to signify to you that he had given me leave to move him in any business of the Church whatsoever, but a charge withal that I should not be earnest in temporal causes, save where I was called in, and that he thought I was mistaken in this. For though your Lordship's person be ecclesiastical, yet the cause, he said, for which you were questioned was temporal, as was also the Court in which you were to answer[r]; and therefore his Majesty required me to forbear any further motion in that business. This was all the answer I could get from him, and all the service which in this particular I have been able to perform to your Lordship, though I were very willing to strain upon his Majesty directions given me to do you this good office, might my mediation have proved effectual.

In the last place, it is very true that divers men have charged upon your Lordship for favouring of sectaries, and

[r] [Bishop Williams was at this time lying under the charge of revealing the King's secrets. See above, p. 71.]

men that have neither loved the uniformity, nor the peace of the Church; but that, my Lord, must rest upon them that have so reported of you. And I hope your Lordship doth not look that I should take anything of theirs upon me. For if they have traduced you, I am not in any part of their fault, nor will I offer at any part of their defence. And if your Lordship can (as you say) make it appear that there are fewer unconformable ministers in that great diocese than have been these sixty years, I think your Lordship will need no other justification than that in this particular. And this also, because I thought it might do you good, I read out of your Lordship's letters to his Majesty. But whereas you add, that you have not been fortunate in the ability and faithfulness of such ecclesiastical officers as have been left to you by the patents of your predecessors; that, perhaps, is not your Lordship's case alone; but, howsoever, it is matter of law, and I shall not meddle with it one way or other.

And thus, my Lord, having given your Lordship a true account of the business you trusted with me, and a real answer to all other parts of your Lordship's letter, I shall forbear to be further troublesome at this present, but assure your Lordship that I shall always be very ready to perform towards you all the duty of my place, and all that I can in any way owe you in Christ's charity, and so rest

Your Lordship's loving Friend and Brother,

Lambeth, September 16th, 1633.

LETTER XLV.

FROM JOHN WILLIAMS, BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

[Lambeth MSS. Numb. mxxx. p. 12.]

MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD AND MY VERY GOOD LORD, —I am much bound unto your Grace for this great pains your Grace was pleased to take in answering a letter, written principally to comply with my duty, and not to

put your Grace (at this time especially) to any molestation. I was an humble suitor indeed unto your Grace, to be my good Lord in mediating unto his most excellent Majesty for the extent of his favours towards me in the general, without the which it is but small comfort that I could promise my afflicted soul in any one particular; nor had I then any distinct thought, either of my cause, or the Court wherein it depended, my prayers aiming at his Majesty's mercies, which are so high above his justice.

Yet God forbid but that princely ear should be always open to your Grace for a poor man, whose person is Ecclesiastical, be his cause never so civil or temporal. Nor do I despair of mine own better fortune in this kind upon your Grace's further opportunities, and my humbling of myself, in the meanwhile, in true devotions towards my God, who hath in His hand the hearts of princes.

For those matters of fact I avowed in my letter, my witness is in Heaven, who I hope will never suffer me to fail in truth or sincerity, for anything can befal me here upon earth.

I humbly thank your Grace for your Christian charity; and will not omit to endeavour, by my duty and service, to merit in time your Grace's other relations; praying, in the meanwhile, Almighty God to bless your Grace with all happiness and prosperity.

Your Grace's most humble

Servant and Suffragan,

JO. LINCOLN.

Buckden, this 19th
of Sept. 1633.

To the Most Reverend Father in God,
my very good Lord, the Lord
Archbishop of Canterbury His
Grace, Primate of all England and
Metropolitan, present these.

Endorsed:—'Recep. Sep. 21, 1633.
The Ld. Bp. of Lincoln's
Lr. of Thanks, &c.'

LETTER XLVI.

TO THE PROVOST OF EDINBURGH.

[Steven's Hist. of Heriot's Hospital[s].]

S. in Christo.

After my hearty commendations, &c. I thank you and the whole Corporation of Edinburgh, for the love and worthy usage which I found, when I was lately in those parts upon attendance of his Majesty[t], as also for the kind letters which I have now received from you. Concerning their contents, I have already performed them as far as I am able: for I took occasion in the presence of the Lord Registrar (who is able to give you an account how heartily I did it) to move his Majesty, that the debt due to Mr. George Heriot, and given to that worthy work which I saw begun, and in good forwardness, may be carefully paid in, that so pious a work may not in that respect be hindered. His Majesty very graciously spake many good words both of Mr. Heriot, and the work, and in my hearing put the Lord Registrar upon the best way that for the present could be thought on, who I doubt not but will give you now at his return some good account of it. And if hereafter your agent, Mr. Johnstone, shall find that there is any further use of my mediation to his Majesty to advance that charitable work, I shall never be sparing of my pains, but be ready to give it and you all the assistance I can. So with remembrance of my love to the whole body of the town, and particularly to the subscribers of the letters to me, I leave you to God's blessed protection, and so rest

Your very loving Friend,

W. CANT.

Lambeth,
Octob.
1633.

To my very worthy friends, my Lord the Provost of Edinburgh, and the rest of his Brethren there.

---

[s] [This letter has been kindly compared with the original by the author the above-named volume.]

[t] [See Diary, Works, vol. iii. p. 217.]

LETTER XLVII.

TO WM. PIERCE, BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS.

[Prynne's Cant. Doom, p. 141.]

S. in Christo.

MY VERY GOOD LORD, &c.—My businesses concerning my Translation are now almost over, and those of Term ready to begin. And in the interim, I am commanded by his Majesty to put you to a little pains. There hath been of late some noise in Somersetshire about the Feasts of the Dedications of Churches, commonly called the Wakes; and it seems, the Judges of assize formerly made an order to prohibit them, and caused it to be published in some or most of the churches there by the minister, without my Lord the Bishop's consent or privity[u]. The pretence of this hath been, that some disorders derogatory from God's service and the government of the commonwealth are committed at those times: by which argument, anything that is abused may be quite taken away. It seems there hath been some heat struck in the country about this, by the carriage of the Lord Chief Justice Richardson at the last two assizes, especially the last, with which his Majesty is not well pleased. And for the preventing of outrages, or disorders, at those feasts, no man can be more careful than his Majesty. But he conceives, and that very rightly, that all these may and ought to be prevented by the care of the Justices of Peace, and not leave the feasts themselves to be kept, for the neighbourly meetings and recreations of the people, of which he would not have them debarred for any frivolous pretences. And further, his Majesty hath been informed also for this last year, since warning was given, there have not been any noted disorders at any of those feasts kept in those parts. Yet, for his better satisfaction, he hath commanded me to require you (which I do by these letters) to send for some of the gravest of your Clergy, and such as stand best affected

[u] [See an account of the disturbances here referred to, in Prynne, Cant. Doom, pp. 141 seq.; and compare, also, Abp. Laud's Hist. of Troubles and Trial, chap. xxvi. Works, vol. iv. pp. 133 seq.]

to the Church and Government in the several parts of your diocese, and by them to inform yourself, how these feasts have been ordered for this last year, and how free they have been from disorders; and to send me up an account of it, such as I may show to his Majesty, of which you must not fail. And he doubts not, but that you will perform the same, like a wise and prudent governor. Thus leaving this business to your care, and desiring you to make as much convenient haste with it as you can, I commend you to God's grace, and rest

Your Lordship's very loving
Friend and Brother,
W. CANT.

Lambeth, Octob. 4,
1633.

LETTER XLVIII.

TO THE LORD VISCOUNT WENTWORTH.

[Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 124, 125.]

Salutem in Christo.

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—In all your Lordship's very large letter, which I lately received, there is not one word of the Archbishop of Dublin's recalling his excommunication[v]; so it may be it is well ended; nor is there one word of your wonted recreation; so it may be, either you are not yet well enough acquainted at Lambeth, or else you are afraid that some sour ghost walks there. But to that which you have written, I shall give your Lordship a very clear answer, and as free as I used to do.

And first, I wholly agree with you, that the wars and their noise stunned the Church; and that, since the time of peace, it hath scarce thriven any better than it did in the war, must needs be in part charged upon the weakness and negligence of the Clergy themselves. But, having agreed with your Lordship thus far, I pray you give me leave to add two other causes, which have nipped the growth of it almost as

[v] [See above, p. 311.]

much as these. The one is the excessive number of the opposite party, and their heartiness to their own side damming up the ears of the people against any other instruction. And the second is, (which I for my part do somewhat believe,) that some of the Lord Deputies, which have been there in former times, have not given it that countenance and assistance which it extremely needed, and which I hope your Lordship will give. But for the recovery of the weakness it is in, I am wholly of your Lordship's belief, that the physicians, that must cure it, are on this side the sea; and further, that the fees allowed in those parts, are not large enough to tempt them over. And to force them in such a case, I can never hold it fit; for such a work will never be mastered by unwilling hands.

It is a very noble resolution in your Lordship to desire to be noted for speaking the best of your friends, rather than the worst of those that love you not. And indeed, my Lord, very seriously I have a very good opinion of all the four men you name, but not so large as your Lordship. And for Dr. Bramhall, I think, with your Lordship's direction and countenance, he will be able to do any service that can be put upon him. And as there is enough to do, so I presume you will set him on work. For that which you do conceive may be my part, whensoever the King shall think fit to do more than is done, and to make a better settlement of the Church, I will, God willing, be wanting to no duty that I am able to perform. In the meantime, since there is such a necessity for an army, as that without it there will be neither obedience to the King, nor respect to the Church, the Bishops which have opposed it, have shown a marvellous deal of weakness. And I am sorry that Kilmore[w] is one of them; especially considering what favour hath been showed to them, and their demesnes, in all the levies that have been for the army. And certainly, the first leisure I have, I will write to the Bishop of Kilmore about it, and all to that effect which you desire.

I heartily thank your Lordship for the enclosed paper which you sent me, though you might have spared the pains, for I was never jealous that you would do anything against

[w] [Dr. William Bedell, appointed Bp. of Kilmore in 1629.]

the good of the Church, or such intentions as I have towards it. For I am most confident, (and I protest my heart and my pen go together,) that since the Reformation there was never any Deputy in that kingdom intended the good of the Church so much, as your Lordship doth. And I hope you are as resolute in your thoughts for me, that, since I was the first man that humbly besought his Majesty to send some of his Chaplains to be Bishops in that kingdom, I shall not now recede from it, unless it be at some times, and upon some particular occasions, when I may receive informations from your Lordship of some very able and deserving men on that side.

Concerning the age of such as should be Bishops in those parts, I see your Lordship and I shall not differ much; for I did never intend, may I have free use of my own judgment, to send you any decrepid men amongst you. For I very well know, that in places where action is less necessary than in Ireland, a man may be as well too old, as too young, for a bishopric. Your Lordship would not have any there under thirty-five, nor above forty-five. And truly, my Lord, I am in the middle way, and that useth to be best; for I would have no man a Bishop anywhere under forty. And if your Lordship understood clergymen as well as I do, I know you would in this be wholly of my judgment. I never in all my life knew any more than one made a Bishop before forty, and he proved so well, that I shall never desire to see more, nor will, if I can hinder it; but this way that I have expressed, have with you upon all occasions both for Church and State. And if at any time I send you any of my acquaintance, and break rule of age, life, or doctrine, lay it upon me home.

My Lord, when I say, the less assistance the more merit, I did not put you off with a compliment, for my answer was real. 'Tis true, able and well-affected men are brave associates, and great services are done at ease by such instruments. But wot you what? Where many are employed at once, and all very able, there usually proves to be in some a fretting cankerworm of ambition, and that for particular aims makes such a division, as gives far greater impediment to the greatest affairs, than any want of sufficiency can make.

And, therefore, by your Lordship's leave, the conceit which you express, of all able, and all hearty, and all running one way, and none caring for any ends so the King be served, is but a branch of Plato's commonwealth, which flourishes at this day nowhere but in Utopia, and thither I have no purpose to send your Lordship.

For your St. John's business, it is yet under examination at Cambridge by commission, and what will become of it I cannot tell[x]. For my own part, I have done Mr. Oldisworth all right to his Majesty; and for Dr. Lane, I never saw him five times in my life, and to my remembrance never spake to him but once. God send the business a good end, for the University and the College sake; for I heartily wish the public well; and, to speak clearly, if the one be not sober enough for the government, I doubt the other may be found too weak: honest and learned is not enough for government.

And now, my Lord, I heartily wish you and your Lady all mutual content that may be; and I did never doubt that you undertook that course but upon mature consideration[y], and you have been pleased to express to me a very good one, in which God bless you and your posterity, though I did not write anything to you as an examiner. For myself, I must confess to your Lordship my weakness, that having been married to a very troublesome and unquiet wife before, I should be so ill-advised as now, being above sixty, to go marry another of a more wayward and troublesome generation. And I hope you are not grown so hard-hearted, but that you will either pardon or pity me in this slip; and the rather, because you write that a Bishop above fifty is fitter for his ease than labour, which had I thought upon as I ought, I might, perhaps, have been free from the burden which now lies heavy upon me; and yet you think that I may leave the

[x] [This refers to the disputed election to the headship of St. John's. Richard Pearson, the nephew and biographer of Holdsworth, in the Life prefixed to his Prelections, Lond. 1661, thus refers to the circumstance: "Collegii D. Johannis alumnus olim et socius ad ejusdem magisterium plurimis et potentioribus sociorum suffragiis delectus est; nonnullorum vero perversitate, aliorum præpotentia, de jure suo cedere coactus est." Both the candidates mentioned in the text were put aside, and Dr. William Beale admitted Feb. 20, 163⅔. Papers relating to the subject are preserved in Baker's MSS. vol. xxvii. pp. 95, 107, and vol. xxx. pp. 405—409.]

[y] [Wentworth had privately married, in Oct. 1632, as his third wife, Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Godfrey Rhodes.]

callings of an unquiet life to answer your large letters. So in haste I leave you to the grace of God, and shall ever rest

Your Lordship's loving and poor

Friend to serve you,

W. CANT.

Lambeth, Oct. 14, 1633.

P.S.—I have herewith sent your Lordship a copy of my letters to the Bishop of Kilmore, which I pray your Lordship to peruse, and if you approve of them, to send them to him, but if otherwise, to burn them. I have received very pitiful letters from the Bishop of Kilfanora[z]; pray your Lordship afford him all the assistance you can. The Queen's Majesty was brought to bed this morning, Oct. 15, of a young duke[a]. God bless them both with strength and happiness.

LETTER XLIX.

TO WILLIAM BEDELL, BISHOP OF KILMORE.

[Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 125, 126.]

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—I am bold to write half-a-dozen lines to you, which I must desire you to take as well as they are meant, both to your person and the cause.

I know not the particulars of your carriage towards the King and his service in those parts, but somewhat there is, either about the levy that concerns the army, or about the laying down of 12*d.* a Sunday for Recusants for a time, in which you are conceived much to have mistaken the King's intentions, and withal as much to have disserved him, in which you are not alone, but other Bishops with you. This is come to his Majesty's ears, and he doth not take it well; and, for my own part, I have reason to be a little sensible, because I was, under God, the man that put your name to his Majesty for preferment, and, therefore, must needs in part suffer for anything that shall be deemed a miscarriage

[z] [James Heygate, consecrated May 9, 1630, died April 30, 1638. Probably the person mentioned above, p. 267.]

[a] [This was James, Duke of York, afterwards King James II.]

in you. I never saw your Lordship to my knowledge, nor did I ever know you but by a little tract of yours against Wadsworth[b]; and were it but for that alone, I should be very sorry you should do anything in your place unlike it; for that is very full of judgment and temper. But for the justification of the King, my master, and for the settling your thoughts, if there be any disturbance in them, I shall briefly say thus much to you: First, for the army, the King having taken very good advice of his Council, is of opinion, that as his affairs stand, there is a necessity of having an army in those parts; and very wise men are likewise of opinion, that, considering the multitude of the Roman party, and the natural disposition of the Irish, there would be little safety, did not his Majesty take the care and the course he doth; and there would be less safety for the Church and clergymen than for any others. Besides, I am informed, that in this levy for the army, there hath been all the favour showed to my Lords the Bishops, that could possibly be, neither their glebes nor their tithes being made liable to the payments.

Secondly, for the laying down 12*d.* a Sunday, and not exacting it for the present, I have no warrant to lay open to you the particular reasons why he doth so, but this I may let you know, that his Majesty conceives he doth it upon all the considerable reasons that may be, and those very well weighed. But if there be either in yourself, or any of your brethren, a misdeeming fear for matter of religion, take this from me, and be assured, that there is no man, nay, no Bishop in that kingdom or this, more truly, conscientiously, and constantly set both for the belief and maintenance of religion, as it is now established, than his Majesty (God be blessed for it) is. And, therefore, I do heartily pray both you and your brethren to lay aside all jealousies, and to advance his Majesty's service by all the good means you can. For I assure you his thoughts, as they are very pious, so they are exceeding royal towards the Church; and I shall be very

[b] [James Wadsworth, of Emmanuel College, a contemporary of Bp. Bedell, was induced, when employed as Chaplain to the English Ambassador in Spain, to join the Church of Rome. Some letters which passed between him and Bedell, are printed at the end of Bp. Burnet's life of the latter.]

sorry to find that the carriage of any, Bishops especially, should cast a damp upon them. Thus, not doubting but you will conform yourself to the King's religious and prudent courses for the settlement of that kingdom and Church, and speedily redeem, either what hath been amiss or mistaken in this matter, I leave you to the grace of God, and rest

Your very loving Friend and Brother,

W. CANT.[1]

Lambeth, Dec. 14, 1633.

LETTER L.

TO DR. CHRISTOPHER POTTER, PROVOST OF QUEEN'S.

[Prynne's Cant. Doom, pp. 251, 252.]

But to the last clause of your letter, about the reprinting of your book[2], I have done that which you have so desired, as you will see by this enclosed paper. They are but a few scattered phrases; and I put them to your consideration, as much for conveniency and charitable expression, as for truth. Do what you will with them, so you mistake not me, in that which yourself have caused me to do; but in that place, p. 26, where you say, it may (vis. Matt. xi. 17) be understood of any assembly, as well civil as ecclesiastical, do you not thereby give as much power to the Parliament as to the Church in Church affairs? I read in haste, and it may be a mistake, but you shall do very well to consider it. So in haste, I leave you to the grace of God, &c.

WILL. CANT.

Endorsed: [illegible] 1633. Doctor Potter, a second impression of his Book, and my Answer to it.

---

[1] [Bishop Bedell's defence of himself, is given in his letters to Lord Wentworth, in Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 146—150, 164.]

[2] "The Book, which Potter subjected to the Archbishop's revision, was "Want of Charity justly charged." Lond. 1634, being his reply to Knott the Jesuit. (See above, vol. v. p. 165.) The passages which Laud objected to in the enclosed paper, and some of which Prynne mentions, were altered in the second edition. These corrections formed part of the charge brought against the Archbishop at his trial. See vol. iv. pp. 279, 351.]

LETTER LI.

TO THE BISHOPS OF HIS PROVINCE.

[Prynne's Cant. Doom, pp. 382—384 [e].]

S. in Christo.

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—His Majesty hath been often and much troubled upon complaints which have been made unto him by the Lords and other men of quality, concerning the multitude of both unlearned and unworthy ministers, which pester the Church, and are always the causes of great scandal, and too often of schism and divisions therein; and some of them are forced, to the shame of themselves and their calling, for want of means to beg for their living; and yet are daily made in great numbers, and that directly against the Canon of the Church, which requires, That no man should be made a minister *sine titulo.* For remedy of this great abuse and wrong to the Church, his Majesty hath directed his letters to me, and by them required me to call all such Bishops to me, as were then in or about the city; and, after consultation with them, to send my letters to every several Bishop within the province, to require obedience to the Canon of the Church, and his Majesty's directions according to it. The tenor of his Majesty's letter followeth:—

"To the most Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and right entirely beloved Counsellor, William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate and Metropolitan of all England, &c.

"CHARLES R.—Most Reverend Father in God, right trusty and right entirely beloved counsellor, we greet you well. There is nothing more dear to us than the preservation of true religion, as it is now settled and established in this our kingdom, to the honour of God, and the great comfort of ourself and our loyal people; and there can nothing more conduce to the advancement thereof than the strict observation of such Canons of the Church as concern those that are to take orders in their several times. More especially of keeping that particular Canon which enjoins, that no man be made a Priest or a Minister without a title. For we find that many, not so qualified, do, by favour or other means, procure themselves to be ordained, and afterwards,

[e] [This letter is entered in Reg. Laud, foll. 191 b, 192 a, and is printed also in Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. pp. 481, 482.]

for want of means, wander up and down to the scandal of their calling; or, to get maintenance, fall upon such courses as are most unfit for them, both by humouring their auditors and by other ways altogether unsufferable. We have, therefore, thought fit, and we do hereby straitly require and charge you to call such Bishops to you as are now present in or near our City of London, and to acquaint them with this our resolution. And, further, that you fail not in the beginning of the next term, to give notice of this our will and pleasure openly in our High Commission Court; and that you call into our said Court every Bishop respectively that shall presume to give orders to any man that hath not a title, and there to censure him as the Canon aforesaid doth enjoin, (which is, to maintain the party so ordered till he give him a title,) and with what other censure you in justice shall think fit. And our further will is, that nothing shall be reputed a title to enable a man for orders, but that which is so by the ancient course of the Church and the Canon Law, so far forth as that Law is received in this our Church of England. And as you must not fail in these our directions, nor in any part of them, so we expect that you give us, from time to time, a strict account of your proceedings in the same. Given under our signet, at our Palace of Westminster, the nineteenth day of September, in the ninth year of our reign."

According to these letters, I am to pray and require you, that at all times of ordination you be very careful to admit none into Holy Orders, but such men as for life and learning are fit, and which have a title for their maintenance, according to the laws and ancient practice of the Church. And his Majesty hath further commanded me to advertise your Lordship, that he will not fail to call for an account of these letters both of me and you. Thus, not doubting but you will have a special care, both of the good of the Church, and his Majesty's contentment therein, I leave you to the grace of God, and rest

Your Lordship's very loving
Friend and Brother,
W. CANT.

Lambeth, Oct. 24,
1633.

There was enclosed in this letter the following paper, endorsed in the Archbishop's hand, stating what should be considered a title:—

[f] [This paper is printed by Heylin, Cypr. Ang. ad ann., in Rushworth's Collection, vol. ii. p. 214, and in Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. p. 482.]

So upon the matter these Titles are named in the Canon. He that is ordained must have—

1. A presentation to some ecclesiastical preferment.

2. Or, A certificate undoubted that he is provided of some church void there.

3. Or, A grant of some Petty Canon's place, or the like, in a Cathedral or Collegiate Church.

4. Or, A Fellow, or in the right of a Fellow, in some College in Oxford or Cambridge.

5. Or, A Conduct or Chaplain in some College in Oxford or Cambridge.

6. Or, A Master of Arts of five years standing, living at his own charge in either of the Universities.

7. Or, The intention of the Bishop that ordains, shortly to admit him to some benefice, or curate's place, then void.

And I think the Canon intends that after a man is once admitted a curate, the parson or vicar of the place should not have power to put them off at pleasure, but only for such criminal unworthiness, as might deprive him of his benefice, if he had one.

So I conceive, under favour, the order may go briefly thus:—

And further, his Majesty's express command is, that this Canon be strictly observed by all Bishops in their several dioceses respectively; and that none presume to ordain any man to be a Deacon, Priest, or Minister, under the penalty enjoined in the Canon, or any other which his Majesty's just displeasure may inflict on him.

LETTER LII.

TO THE BISHOPS OF HIS PROVINCE.

[Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. p. 484 [g].]

S. in Christo.

My very good Lord,—It hath pleased his Majesty to command the reprinting of a Declaration, published in his royal father's time of blessed memory, and intituled, 'The King's Majesty's Declaration to his subjects concerning lawful sports

[g] [From Reg. Laud, fol. 192a.]

to be used, &c.[h]' wherein, as your Lordship shall find at the latter end thereof, every Bishop is enjoined to see that the books be distributed to the several parishes within his diocese, and there published to the people, to the end they may know his Majesty's princely care over them; and to the effectual performance of this, I make no doubt but your Lordship will use all diligence. And I am commanded to give you notice hereof, because his Majesty expects no less from you; and your officers are to send for the books accordingly. So with my love remembered, I leave you to the grace of God, and rest

Your Lordship's very loving Friend and Brother,

W. CANT.

Lambeth, October 28,
1633.

LETTER LIII.

TO THE LORD VISCOUNT WENTWORTH.

[Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 155—157.]

Salutem in Christo.

MY VERY GOOD LORD,—It seems by your late letters which I have received, that you have taken your leave of Fulham. The Bishop you say is gone, and I believe that's true. God speed him as well where he now is, as He did there. As for your letters and yourself, when you come, they shall be as welcome to Lambeth as they were to Fulham. And since you have learned the way to be a little merry, I would you and your cousin Sibbes had been the other day at the Council-table, where I never heard, you know whom, in a better mood verily.

I am very glad to read your Lordship so resolute, and more to hear you affirm, that the footing of them, which go thorough for our master's service, is not now upon fee, as it hath been. But you are withal upon so many 'ifs,' that by their help you may preserve any man upon ice, be it never so slippery. As first, if the common lawyers may be contained within their ancient and sober bounds; if the word

[h] [This Declaration is reprinted in Wilkins' Conc. tom. iv. pp. 483, 484.]

'thorough' be not left out (as I am certain it is); if we grow not faint; if we ourselves be not in fault; if it come not to a *Peccatum ex te, Israel;* if others will do their parts as thoroughly as you promise for yourself, and justly conceive of me. Now I pray, with so many, and such 'ifs' as these, what may not be done, and in a brave and noble way? But can you tell when these 'ifs' will meet, or be brought together? Howsoever, I am resolved to go on steadily in the way which you have formerly seen me go, so that (to put in one 'if' too) if anything fail of my hearty desires for the King and the Church's service, the fault shall not be mine.

The indisposition, of which I wrote unto your Lordship, I thank God, passed over quickly, though I find that I cannot follow your counsel, for Croydon is too far off to go often to it, and my leisure here hath hitherto been extremely little, I may truly call it none. Besides, the Lady Davis hath prophesied against me, that I shall not many days outlive the 5th of November[i], and then to what end should I trouble myself with exercise, or the like?

My Lord, I thank you, that you are pleased so kindly and so nobly to take that which I wrote unto you about the Archbishop of Dublin[k], and his taking upon him, together with the rest of the Popish clergy, to meddle with the civil government, of which I doubt not but your Lordship will be very careful, as of all things else that may weaken the power of that party in that kingdom. But I had not ventured to write anything to you in this business, if your Lordship had not required it of me. But your Lordship doth very prudently in bearing with them, till the Parliament be over, that there you may make use of them for the King's service. And that contention between the Regulars and the Seculars is grown so general and so warm, that you may easily hold up Harris[l], if no decision come to the contrary; and a brave service it will be, if you can settle the revenues of that kingdom.

[i] [See Diary, Nov. 13, 1633. Works, vol. iii. p. 220.]

[k] [See above, p. 311.]

[l] [Paul Harris, Dean (as he styles himself) of the University of Dublin, one of the protestors against Archbishop Fleming. (Prynne's Hidden Works, p. 109.)]

I perceive you mean to build, but as yet your materials are not come in; but if that work do come to me before Christmas [m], as you promise it shall, I will rifle every corner in it; and you know, my good Lord, after all your bragging, how I served you at York, and your church-work there; especially I pray provide a good riding-house, if there be ever a decayed body of a church to make it in, and then you shall be well fitted, for you know one is made your stable already [n], if you have not reformed it, of which I did look for an account according to my remembrances before this time [o].

I find your Lordship hath a good opinion of my Lord Primate's learning and honesty, and I verily think he will not deceive your expectation in either; but you are pleased to ask me another question, whether that be all that goes to a good Bishop and a good governor? I must needs answer, No; but if that which is further required be wanting in him, I am the more sorry; but I will tell you, my Lord, I pray God, all be well in his and the other Bishops' apprehensions concerning your Lordship, and your government there. For before you went, I writ, as I thought, and as I think still, very largely in your commendation, how thorough you would be for the King and the Church. It may be they understood this otherwise than I could mean it, or your Lordship perform it, and did not look with such a prudent eye as they should, upon the necessities of that place. And methinks it may stand for an observation, that I, which had frequent letters before from my Lord Primate, have not received any one, that I remember, since your Lordship went thither.

My Lord, I did not take you to be so good a physician before, as I now see you are; for the truth is, a great many Church-cormorants have fed so full upon it, that they are fallen into a fever; and for that no physic better than a vomit, if it be given in time; and, therefore, you have taken a very judicious course to administer one so early to my Lord of Cork [p]. I hope it will do him good, though per-

[m] [The expected letter was written by Wentworth in the following December (Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 171.—174.)]

[n] [See ibid. p. 173.]

[o] [See above, p. 307.]

[p] [Dr. Elrington (Life of Ussher, p. 158, note [z]) gives the following information:—"The ravages which this mighty Earl had committed upon the property of the Church were very extensive. His great attempt was

chance he thinks not so, for if the fever hang long about him or the rest, it will certainly shake either them or their estates in pieces. Go on, my Lord. I must needs say, this is 'thorough' indeed, and so is your physic too, for a vomit never ends kindly, that doth not work both ways, and that is 'thorough.' Nor can I answer what became of the Primate and the rest of the Bishops, while the poor inferior clergy were thus oppressed, more than this, that I ever thought it was not in their power to help it. But if any of them be as bad for oppression of the Church as any layman, that I am sure is unanswerable; and if it appear so to you, great pity it is, but some one or other of the chief offenders should be made a public example, and turned out of his bishopric. And, I believe, such a course once held, would do more good in Ireland, than anything that hath been there these forty years.

Now for your question, what my Lord of Cork will say? I cannot tell; but sure I am, so many of the fraternity, as think it Popery to set the Communion-table at the end of the church, and for the Prebends to come in their formalities to church, are either ignorant or factious fools. But I warrant you, the poor vicar thinks very well of you, and so doth the King, to whom I have told what physic you have given the Earl of Cork.

But I warrant you, I am thought as odd an Archbishop, as you can be a Deputy; for my Lady Davis, she prophesies against me, that I shall not many days outlive the 5th of

purchasing the College of Youghall on a doubtful title, and then endeavouring to obtain a grant of it from his brother, the Bishop of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross, at that time Warden of the College. Lord Strafford summoned him before the High Court of Castle Chamber, where he forced him to abide his arbitration, and then awarded that he should pay 15,000*l.* to the King, for the issues of thirty-five years, and that all the appendant advowsons should be seized for the Crown. This was not the only occasion on which Lord Strafford forced him to give up his ill-gotten possessions. Lord Strafford, in March 1634, writes thus: 'No longer since than this term, a poor vicar was restored to an impropriation and two vicarages, usurped there, thirty years and better, by the Earl of Cork. We put him in possession, the case in good faith very clear.' (Strafforde Letters, vol. i. p. 380.) And Dr. Bramhall states, that the Earl of Cork holds the whole Bishopric of Lismore, at the rent of 40*s.*, or five marks by the year (Letter to Archbishop Laud [Works, vol. i. p. lxxxi.]). The Earl of Cork, in his Diary, says, that Lord Strafford prejudiced him no less than 40,000*l.* in his personal estate, and in his inheritance 2,000 marks a year."]

November. And I think I sent your Lordship word before of one Bowyer, a rogue that broke prison, but said he came newly from beyond the seas, and went up and down the country railing against me, and making me no less than a traitor; but he was brought to the Star-Chamber, the 13th of November, and there soundly censured, the rogue confessed all, and all by the devil, but would acknowledge no confederates[q]. And now there is another fellow half-mad, that comes into the Court with a great sword by his side, and rails upon the Archbishop, God knows for what, and says, he will have justice of the King against him, or take another course for it himself[r]. Would not this encourage any man to do service?

One thing more, and then I have done. You will herein find an inclosed paper; it came from my Lord the Bishop of Durham[s], and by it you may see the effects of your composition in the North; do you not think this may make a fine noise in time? I hope you will hear of this the next Parliament, as well as others have done for less matters. Well, it is time to make an end, and so I leave you to the grace of God, and rest

Your Lordship's poor loving Friend to serve you,

W. CANT.

Lambeth, November
15th, 1633.

[The following is the enclosed Paper.]

MY LORD,—I am hereby occasioned to let your Grace understand that we are marvellously pestered with this generation even in this town, more than in other places, and in Northumberland infinitely, and, which is worse, we find now by experience, a daily revolt, upon presumption of that composition, which was religiously intended by his Majesty for reclaiming of them, and as zealously endeavoured and pursued by my Lord Deputy to the same end, as I dare swear to be true upon both their full expressions. But the wisest physicians do not always hit upon the malady and malignancy of the disease; for now the compounders think

[q] [See Diary, Nov. 13, 1633, Works, vol. iii. p. 219.]

[r] [Ibid. p. 220.]

[s] [Thomas Morton.]

themselves freed from all command of conference, as concluding they must not be troubled for conscience, by the which reason they may harbour their unconscionable and traitorous intendments, by whose peremptoriness and boldness it falls out, that profane persons, being urged by excommunication, or otherwise, will needs turn recusants. Nor this only, but when it is required, that their children at Grammar Schools should be catechised, they threaten to send them rather to be schooled at Douay, or some other Seminary College beyond the seas. My Lord, God by His providence hath placed your Grace a chief pilot in this Church, whose wisdom it will be to endeavour to find some means to stop this leak, which threatens a subversion of the Church in these parts. I shall pray God you may effect it[t].

LETTER LIV.

FROM JOHN WILLIAMS, BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

[Lambeth MSS. Numb. mxxx. p. 13.]

MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD AND MY VERY GOOD LORD,—Finding more by effects than any promises, your Grace's favours bending towards me, I do not know any better way how to requite these beginnings, than by imploring your Grace's crowning and perfecting of them, obliging myself by this presumption either to become your Grace's true and faithful servant, or to be held unworthy of any esteem or repute in the world for the remainder of my life.

For my sincere affections to the service of the Church of England, and the Head thereof under Christ, I appeal to your Grace's former knowledge and recordation of me when I was in place and employment; your Grace knowing more

[t] [Wentworth's reply to this letter, in which he notices the progress he had made in the reform of the Church, and particularly notices this complaint of the Bishop of Durham, is found in Strafforde Letters, vol. i. pp. 171-174. An account of the compositions made by Wentworth with recusants, is given by Prynne, Hidden Works, pp. 95, 96. He was in this acting under the directions of the King's Proclamation, dated July 7, 1628, the title of which is mentioned by Prynne (ibid.)]

at that time of my secrets in this kind, than all the Churchmen of England have known before or since. And I humbly beseech your Grace to take view of me by that true light, rather than by the false representations of other men, who, peradventure, have with their deceitful colours, in these days of my misfortunes, painted me out as ugly unto your Grace, as they have done your Grace formidable unto me.

Sir John Lambe can tell your Grace, if he list, that I never favoured, but cordially hated and abhorred all schismatics and puritans, and never conceived any quarrel against him (which I humbly for all that do lay down at your Grace's feet) but for representing me, for his own ends (as I was informed), a favourer of this untoward kind of people, who themselves never favoured man that wore a rochet, what other disposition soever he was of. But if my sins shall permit your Grace to prevail so far with his Majesty as to restore me once more to my peace, and to such a portion of his princely favour as I may be conceived to remain *in statu merendi*, I shall in a very short time clear all suspicions of this kind, and so behave myself for the future that it shall never repent his Majesty of this clemency, nor your Grace of this intercession. To this end I humbly beseech your Grace to present this enclosed petition unto his most excellent Majesty, and to believe that I shall for these great favours ever continue,

Your Grace's most humble and much obliged

Servant and Suffragan,

JO. LINCOLN.

Westmr. Coll. this
— of December, 1633.

To the most reverend Father in God his very good Lord, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, &c. &c.

Endorsed:—'Rec. Decr. 4, 1633, L. Bp. of Lincoln his letter to desire me to deliver the petition inclosed to the King, which I did, Decr. 8, 1633.'

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY ORGANIZED 1891

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 014 861 400

DA
396
L3A2
v.6
pt.1

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
CECIL H. GREEN LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(415) 723-1493

All books may be recalled after 7 days

DATE DUE

F/S JUN 30 1997

APR 09 1997